97-84202-20

Facts for the people of the South

Washington

1855

97-84202-20
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 834

Facts for the people of the South. Abolition intolerance and religious intolerance united. Know-nothingism exposed. Washington, Printed at the Union office, 1855.

42 p. 22½cm.

[~~Miscellaneous pamphlets, v. 80, no. 7~~]

"The facts and arguments contained in the following pages ... are generally taken from the columns of the Washington union."

1. American party.

CA 28-519 Unrev'd

Library of Congress AC901.M5 vol. 80
[2]

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 10:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 9-30-97 INITIALS: AP

TRACKING # : 28246

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

2.

FACTS

FOR

THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH.

ABOLITION INTOLERANCE AND RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE UNITED.

KNOW-NOTHINGISM EXPOSED.

308
Z
Box 834

WASHINGTON:
PRINTED AT THE UNION OEFICE.
1855.

48911D

48911D SEP 23 1959

[The facts and arguments contained in the following pages are submitted to the candid and conscientious citizens of the Southern States, and are generally taken from the columns of the Washington Union.]

Position of the Democratic party on the questions now at issue between Democracy on the one hand, and the united isms of abolition, nativeism, religious intolerance, and the secret societies.

The following resolution has been passed by *four* Democratic National Conventions:

"That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the democratic faith; and every attempt to abridge the privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us, ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute-books."

WHAT WILL VIRGINIA DO?

Of what have the people of Virginia grown tired, that they should listen to the false and corrupting argument, that the democracy of that State should be overthrown because the abolitionists of Massachusetts have been put down by another set of abolitionists? Why should the cry of hostility to the old parties, responded to by men who had no party ties, be potent to awaken the echoes of northern fanaticism in the valleys and mountains of the storied Old Dominion? Virginia is the sanctuary of those principles which protect the individual, which elevate the States in their sovereign capacities, which resist excessive legislation, and which, in their broadest sense, assert and define the inalienable rights of conscience among our people, wherever born. What citizen of Virginia has grown weary of those principles? What Virginia democrat has grown tired of remembering Washington, Henry, Jefferson, Monroe, and Madison? Has it become necessary, in order to grace the triumph of a party based upon hatred to all those principles which are the *peculiar growth* of the Old Dominion, to signalize that act by a formal repudiation of those illustrious names? Is Virginia tired of Jefferson's Declaration of Independence? Is it weary of his glorious act of religious toleration? Is it sated with the recollection of the persevering and ennobling struggles for religious equality long before that act became a law? Is it a painful memory of such men as Marshall, as Wythe, as Barbour, in liberalizing their constitution, and in presenting it to posterity, among whom they may be said to have labored, as a guide and a star through a mysterious future? "Let us break up the old order of things," say the reforming politicians of Massachusetts, who are united upon one thing only—and that, hostility to the South; and this cry is sent back by a few benighted presses in the Old Dominion. So, then, Virginia is to be taught by Massachusetts? The voices that have long derided "Virginia abstractions," and persecuted Virginia statesmen, are to be received as ocular teachings by the present generation. The Josiah Quincys are to lead the descendants and disciples of James Madison. The offspring of the members of the Hartford Convention are to be followed in their war upon creeds and sects by those who are proud of the example of Virginia when the rights of men have been in peril. Even Boston, whose people drove from their midst a Virginia gentleman in pursuit of his property secured to him by the law, now calls upon Virginia to second her decision in favor of the new party. We shall next have Mr. Sumner demanding from Virginia an ovation for his treasonable expressions against the South; and Thaddeus

Stevens will be claiming Virginia gratitude because, though he grossly insulted her on the floor of Congress, has made up for it by joining the know-nothings.

There is something unnatural in the bare idea of seeing Virginia fall a prey to this devouring fanaticism; and it is this that fills us with confidence that she will cast it as a reptile from her bosom. Her open and out-spoken policy—her illustrious past—her constellation of great men, whose works still stir a great nation, and whose examples have been applauded by distant worlds—the sacred blood that enriches her soil—the history that has made her a leader among her sisters, and the noble Commonwealths that have sprung from her loins—let us hope that all these influences will be able to expel from her borders that political disease before which so many have yielded, and for which our country will repent in humiliation through all coming time.

SECRET SOCIETIES *vs.* FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, FREEDOM OF SPEECH, FREEDOM OF ACTION, FREEDOM IN MATTERS OF CONSCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Within a brief period there has sprung up in various parts of the country a secret society, commonly called "know-nothings," who boast that they control the political elements of the United States. They claim that no man can be elected to a public office against whom they exert their power, or prosper in his business where their influence is controlling, if they oppose him. The principles of the Declaration of Independence, the soul-stirring creed of our revolutionary heroes and patriots, the elements of freedom in our constitution, the benign character of our laws, and the charitable, forgiving, and brotherly affection of our holy religion, are all banished from objects of these societies, and their places supplied by principles of an opposite and hostile character. We extract below some of the oaths and ceremonies of this new secret political society.

It will be seen with what skill members are wheedled into these societies. The great points which the managers seek to establish, and through which they expect to control, are—

1. The managers, who are usually whigs, think for the fraternity, who are bound to act in conformity with their thoughts.

2. The freedom of speech in relation to the political and religious schemes of the managers is denied to all those who have been drawn into these anti-freedom traps.

3. The freedom of action is expressly prohibited in all cases where the managers may order their subordinates to perform a specific act, however wrong or illiberal it may be.

4. No member of these societies is at liberty to follow the dictates of his own conscience; but he must yield everything to those who are the great men of the concern, and who profit by them, even if he violates natural affection, his own sense of propriety and right, or the duties of religion.

5. He must wage war upon religion and those who profess it, if its formalities are of a particular kind, whether conformable to the doctrines of revelation or not, and whether its professor is honest, pure, patriotic, and blameless, or otherwise. Such are some of the characteristics of this new secret society which has been brought into existence to retrieve the fortunes of defeated whig candidates, whose published creeds have received the condemnation of the American people.

What do these skulking, tongue-tied patriots want? The answer is plain. They desire office, which they cannot obtain from the votes of freemen, who canvass their merits and act with fearless independence. They can only succeed by machinery, which enables its managers to control the votes of others, who blindly consent to act as their bondsmen, and who are incapable of thinking and acting for themselves. Will an American freeman consent to have a master tell him how he

shall act and vote, or what religion he shall profess? Never. Still, this cunning contrivance has no other object than enabling the managers to control and give the vote of their subordinate and submissive brethren as they shall direct—and all to give the leaders the offices within reach. Those whom they use in their unholy work are in no way to be benefited by becoming the instruments of the managers. It is offices, and not patriotic and commendable measures, that they seek to control. In the name of liberty, they deprive their followers of the right to think, act, and vote, and subject them to the slavery of obedience, or to the endurance of the penalties which they have contrived for the disobedient. This is one of the most stupendous inventions ever contrived to destroy liberty of thought and action that have been disclosed to the world. But it is becoming harmless. The poor humbugged member must mind his master, or receive a dreaded punishment. Is this the freedom of which America boasts? Is he who votes as others direct, a freeman? Can such a craven-spirited man be a democrat? We copy the following from the Cincinnati Daily Enquirer:

ABSTRACT OF THE OATHS AND PRINCIPLES OF THE MYSTERIOUS ORDER OF KNOW-NOTHINGS.

The candidate is first proposed by a member of the order to the council without his knowledge. Three negative votes *black-ball* him. If elected, he is secretly requested to present himself in the ante-room of the council, when an officer appears from within, and administers to him the following oath:

"I, ——, | do solemnly swear | upon this sacred volume, (or cross,) before Almighty God and these witnesses, | that I will not divulge any question proposed to me here, | whether I become a member | of this order or not; | and that I will never, under any circumstances whatever, | *mention the name of any person* | *I may see present* | *during any of the meetings, or that I know of any such order to be in existence,* | and that I will a true answer make to every question asked of me, | so help me God!"

Which being seriously taken by the candidate, the officer proceeds to propound the following interrogations, before reporting to the council his fitness for initiation:

"1. What is your name? 2. What is your age? 3. Where is your residence? 4. In your religious belief are you a Roman Catholic? 5. Where were you born? 6. Where were your parents born? 7. Did either of your ancestors take a part in the American revolution? 8. Are you willing to use all the influence you possess in favor of native-born American citizens for all offices of honor, trust, or profit in the gift of the people; and do you promise to vote for them to the exclusion of all aliens and foreigners, and Roman Catholics in particular, for all local, State, or government officers? 9. Who invited you to be present on this occasion?"

If the candidate's answers are satisfactory to these questions, he is taken into the council by two officers, led up to the *president* of the *council*, who administers the following oath in the *first degree:*

"I, ——, voluntarily and freely do solemnly promise and swear, before Almighty God and these witnesses around me assembled, that I will not, under any circumstances whatever, divulge or make known to any person or persons, either directly or indirectly, or to any human being other than those I shall know to be good and true members of this order, the name, secrets, mysteries, or objects of the same, or cause or allow the same to be done by others, if within my power to prevent the same: binding myself under no less penalty than that of being excommunicated from the order, and having my name posted and circulated throughout the different councils of the order as a traitor and perjurer to both my God and country, and as being unworthy to be employed, instrusted, countenanced, or supported in any business transaction whatever, and as a person totally unworthy of the confidence of all good men, and one at whom the finger of scorn shall ever be pointed. I furthermore promise that, if I should hereafter be expelled from or voluntarily leave this order, I will consider this obligation as binding out of it as in it. All of which foregoing I voluntarily and freely subscribe to, so help me God!"

The candidate is then led to an officer called the judge advocate, who harangues him after this manner. (There are generally half a dozen or more initiated together.)

"My Brothers: The order which has now received you as members may, with all propriety, be considered a secret organization. It is so secret, in fact, that if you were placed before a legal tribunal, and there sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, you could not for your lives reveal the name of that band of brothers among whom your name now stands enrolled: and further than this, when you retire from this meeting, you will return to your families and friends as ignorant as when you came, as far as the name of this order is concerned.

"In common with ourselves, you '*know nothing;*' and let it be your stern resolve through life to 'know nothing' that will at all conflict with the high and exalted duties you owe to your God, your country, and yourselves, so far as regards the preservation of American liberty, which can alone be secured to ourselves and our children by the entire and absolute exclusion of all foreign influence in those matters which appertain to our government policy."

After the delivery of this patriotic address, the candidate is referred to the *instructor*, who teaches him the *signs* and *grips*, and in what manner to obtain entrance into the council. He is then master of the first degree, and signs his name to the register. If he *behaves well* two weeks, and it is conceded that he will do to become a full-blooded know-nothing—abstains from all *blab* outside the council—his friends propose him for the second degree. After election to that degree, he and others are brought in, and take the following oath:

"I, ——, do solemnly promise and swear before Almighty God and these witnesses, that I will not, under any circumstances, divulge or make known the name of this order, or its objects, to any person or persons in the world, unless to those whom I may know to belong to this order, in good and regular standing.

"And I furthermore promise and swear that I will neither write, print, paint, cut, carve, engrave, emboss, stamp, stain, or mark any secrets of this order on anything movable or immovable on the earth or sea, whereby said secrets, or any part thereof, the name of the order, its operations, the names of its officers, or the names of its members, or its place of meeting, may become known to those who have not received the *first* and second degrees of this order in due form; nor will I cause or permit the same to be done if within my power to prevent the same.

"And I furthermore promise and swear that I will always conform to the will of the majority of the members of this order in the selection of candidates to fill every office of honor, profit, or trust, within the gift of the people, provided such candidates shall have been born of American parents, on American soil, and shall have been educated in American institutions; and that I will use all the influence I may possess to elect all such candidates whom I may know to be opposed to all foreign influence, Popery, Jesuitism, and Catholicism, without any hesitation on my part whatever. And I furthermore promise and swear that I will strictly conform to and abide by the oath I have now taken, and that I will strict obedience pay to the constitution, laws, rules, ritual, and edicts of the honorable grand council of this order, of the State of ——, and to the by-laws of —— council No. —, to which I now belong, or to those of any other grand or subordinate council from which I may hereafter hail, binding myself under the no less penalties than are attached or belong to those who violate the oath of the *first degree* of this order. All the foregoing I voluntarily and freely subscribe to of my own free will and accord, so help me God!"

This candidate is also led off to the *judge advocate*, and afterwards to the *instructor;* but their speeches and lectures are not inserted here for want of space.

Obligation Third Degree.

"I, ——, kneeling before God, my Maker, my left hand upraised toward Heaven, my right hand grasping the flag of my native land, of my own free will and accord, do solemnly and sincerely promise, declare, and swear, that I will never communicate any of the secrets of this degree to any person or persons in the world, except within the body of a legally organized council of this order, or to a known brother of this degree, and not unto them until I am well assured that they are just and upright brethren, who are legally entitled to receive the same. I also promise and swear that I will due obedience pay to the constitution, laws, and edicts of the honorable grand council of the State of ——, and to the laws which govern council No. —, so far as they may come to my knowledge.

"I also promise and swear that whenever I may vote at any election, that vote shall, in all cases, be given for native-born American citizens only, and that I will ever seek the political advancement of those men who are good and true members of this order.

"I also promise and swear that this and all other obligations which I have previously taken in this order shall be kept through life sacred and inviolate. I also promise and swear that whenever I may hear the sign or see the signal of distress given by any brother of this order, I will hasten at once to his immediate relief at the peril of my own life.

"I also promise and swear that I will ever contribute my means, in such sums as I can spare without personal inconvenience, to the advancement of our views, and to the extension of American principles through the medium of the grand council of the State of ——.

"I also promise and swear that I will never permit a spurious or clandestine member of this order to participate in any of the benefits or the advantages thereof, and that I will never encourage, countenance, uphold, recognise, or support a spurious or clandestine council of this order.

"To all these and those I do most sincerely promise, declare, and swear, binding myself under no less a penalty than that of having my grave trampled on by foreigners, and to have my memory cursed by my children and my children's children as a traitor to their welfare, to my country, and to my God. So help me God, and witness my obligation."

The judge advocate then addresses the new initiated brethren in this degree as follows:

"My Brothers: The different obligations you have taken in this order, through its different degrees, must have convinced you that all who claim to be American citizens have certain important duties to perform toward themselves and to society at large, which duties can in no instance be set aside or annulled without a palpable violation of the dearest rights and privileges which, as an admirer of republican freedom, each and every member of our organization would wish to enjoy.

"The peculiar formation of our order is such, and its designs to accord with the wishes of its members, that by a system of concerted action on the part of our brotherhood, we can bring about a *series of practical results* in our governmental policy that would in any other light be deemed wholly impracticable. Simply and alone, it is in vain to contend against the hydra-headed monsters of Jesuitism and Catholicism; but united in one common cause, determined to secure the liberties of our native land at all hazards, or perish in the attempt, we cannot fail of success. Our cause is a righteous one, the motives which actuate us are of no ordinary character, and we trust that no brother among us will ever be found absent from his post in the hour of danger."

The candidate is then again taken to the instructor, who gives him the signs, pass-words, and grips of this degree."

He pays *a dime* to the secretary at the initiation of each degree, and fifty cents on first entering the ante-room for examination. After the third degree has been thus administered, the secretary gives him a travelling card, like this:

——, ——, ——, 1854.

John Smith is a member in good standing of Molly Stark Council, No. 40, of the State of ——.

JOHN STILES, *Secretary.*

Molly Stark Council, No. 40, [*] ——.

The card is carried in the pocket-book, and admits a member into any council in the State.

POSITION OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.

To the Catholics.

In an address to the Catholics of the United States, written in December, 1787, acknowledging their services, and testifying to their devotion to the cause of American liberty, he uses the following language:

"As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberty: and I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution and the establishment of their gov-

eration, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic religion is professed.

"I thank you, gentlemen, for your kind concern for me. While my life and my health shall continue, in whatever situation I may be, it shall be my constant endeavor to justify the favorable sentiments you are pleased to express of my conduct; and may the members of your society in America, animated alone by the pure spirit of Christianity, and *still conducting themselves as the faithful subjects of our free government, enjoy every temporal and spiritual felicity*

"GEORGE WASHINGTON."

How severely does the language quoted above reflect upon the know-nothing conspirators of the present day! How different in its spirit from their fierce intolerance and bigotry! Washington, bearing his testimony that the Catholics had conducted themselves "as the faithful subjects of our free government," says that all those who act as worthy members of the community are *equally* entitled to its protection. Washington furthermore says: "I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality." But we have a secret society among us doing all it can to frustrate the hopes, in this respect, of the Father of his Country. When, in connexion with the above, we remember the fact that Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned his countrymen against countenancing secret political societies, we think all will agree with us in stigmatizing that know-nothing who appeals to Washington as authority for his conduct either a gross ignoramus or a designing knave.

To the Baptists.

We have been taught that George Washington was not merely the Father of his Country, but that he was the great exemplar for all nations and for all time. His mission was not a mission for warring religious sectarians, or for the *natives* of the colonies. He drew his sword in the cause of civil and religious liberty, and freely perilled his life and fortune for the rights of conscience, as well as for freedom of action, without reference to native or foreign born—Catholic or Protestant. To show what an exalted estimate Washington placed upon religious toleration, we give below the letter which he addressed, soon after his inauguration as President, to the General Committee of the Baptist Church of Virginia:

"Gentlemen, I request that you will accept my best acknowledgments for your congratulation on my appointment to the first office in the nation: the kind manner in which you mention my past conduct equally claims the expression of my gratitude.

"After we had, by the smiles of Divine Providence on our exertions, obtained the object for which we contended, I retired at the conclusion of the war with an idea that my country could have no further occasion for my services, and with the intention of never entering again into public life; but, when the exigencies of my country seemed to require me once more to engage in public affairs, an honest conviction of duty superseded my former resolution, and became my apology for deviating from the happy plan which I had adopted. If I could have entertained the *slightest apprehension* that the constitution framed in the convention where I had the honor to preside might possibly *endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society*, certainly *I would never have placed my signature to it;* and if I could now conceive that the general government might ever be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny and every species of religious persecution; for you doubtless remember I have often expressed my sentiments that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.

"While I recollect with satisfaction that the religious society of which you are members have been throughout America uniformly and almost unanimously the firm friends to civil liberty and the persevering promoters of our glorious revolution, I cannot hesitate to believe that they will be the faithful supporters of a free yet efficient general government. Under this pleasing expectation, I rejoice to assure them that they may rely upon my best wishes and endeavors to advance their prosperity; in the mean time be assured, gentlemen, that I entertain a proper sense of your fervent supplications to God for my temporal and eternal happiness.

"I am, gentlemen, your most obedient servant,

"GEORGE WASHINGTON."

The heart of every true American must instinctively respond to the noble and enlightened sentiments which Washington gave utterance to on this occasion. How promptly they are recognised and how faithfully they are carried out by his pretended worshippers in the know-nothing lodges, may be inferred after perusing the following extract from the Boston Bee:

"In the house, yesterday, on motion of Mr. Carey, of Ipswich, an order was passed instructing the committee on conditional amendments to report a bill to prevent Roman Catholics from holding an office under the government of the State of Massachusetts."

THE PLATFORM OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.—CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

Thomas Jefferson is recognised by all democrats as the founder of the democratic party. He was their champion and standard-bearer in the first conflict between republicanism and federalism. His election to the presidency was the first great democratic triumph. Claiming to adhere to the same distinctive political principles on which Mr. Jefferson triumphed over Mr. Adams, we cannot too frequently recur to those principles for our present guidance and encouragement. Fortunately for the facility of making this retrospect, Mr. Jefferson has placed upon his own imperishable record an authentic and comprehensive enumeration of the fundamental principles of democracy on which his own election was based, and on which he determined to administer the government. This enumeration is contained in his inaugural address delivered on the 4th of March, 1801, when he entered upon the duties of Chief Magistrate of the Union. We quote from it as follows:

"About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear; stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever State or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information, and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; and freedom of person under the protection of the *habeas corpus;* and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety."

In another part of the same address Mr. Jefferson made the following emphatic appeal to his countrymen: "Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. *And let us reflect, that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions.*"

Every true democrat will recognise in this enumeration the outline of those principles which have constituted the bond of union in the democratic party ever since their first triumphant assertion in the election of Mr. Jefferson. By these principles measures have been tested for more than fifty years, and have been rejected as federal, and adopted as democratic, according to this standard.

A VOICE FROM JEFFERSON.

[From his first annual message, December 1, 1801.]

I cannot omit recommending a revival of the laws on the subject of naturalization. Considering the ordinary chances of human life, a denial of citizenship under fourteen years is a denial to a great proportion of those who ask it, and controls a policy pursued from their first settlement by many of these States, and still believed of consequence to their posterity; and shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? The constitution, indeed, has wisely provided that, for admission to certain offices of important trust, a residence shall be required sufficient to develop character and design. But might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to every one manifesting a *bona fide* purpose of embarking his life and fortunes permanently with us?—with restrictions, perhaps, to guard against the fraudulent usurpation of our flag—an abuse which brings so much embarrassment and loss upon the genuine citizen, and so much danger to the nation of being involved in war, that no endeavor should be spared to detect and suppress it.

AN EXPRESSIVE BUT SILENT TRUTH.

At this moment, when the combined fanaticisms of the day, operating under the auspices of a secret organization, are conducting a successful crusade alike against the rights of the States and the civil and religious rights of individuals, the *silence of the whig leaders* is full of painful meaning. Where now is General Scott, who, in 1852, flattered the so-called "foreign voters," exhausting his vocabulary of compliments to the "rich Irish brogue" and "sweet German accent?" These citizens are now in peril; they want friends; they are assailed, and need defenders. In this the hour of their extremity, however, the hero of Lundy's Lane is silent as the grave. There is not a word from Rufus Choate—not a word from Wm. M. Meredith—nothing from Reverdy Johnson—Mr. Fillmore preserves his usual stolid silence; and the ordinary observer would suppose that the whig leaders were dead, not sleeping, from their apparent indifference at a time so full of interest as the present.

THE ALLEGIANCE OF CATHOLICS—THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

No man who acknowledges allegiance to any foreign potentate or power, or who holds himself under obligations to obey the edicts of any such potentate or power, shall be by my vote placed in any post or office under the American government.—*Mr. Clayton's Letter.*

The only plausible ground on which the incorporation into a political organization of a principle of religious intolerance can be rested is embodied in the foregoing sentence from Senator Clayton's late letter. Its meaning is, that the members of the Roman Catholic Church believe in the temporal power of the Pope,

and, hence, that they owe and acknowledge allegiance to a foreign potentate; and, for that reason, that they ought to be proscribed and excluded from all posts and offices under the American government. This proposition presents a political question which deserves to be investigated with care and calmness. If the allegation be true, it is difficult to see how the conclusion can be resisted that Roman Catholics are disqualified to execute official trusts under our constitution and laws. If the allegation be not true, then the issue resolves itself into the simple question whether a religious test shall be required as a test of qualification to any office or public trust under our government.

With every sympathy of our heart and every conviction of our judgment thoroughly imbued with Protestantism, we propose to examine the truth of the allegation on which rests the main strength of the secret order of know-nothings. Mere prejudice against foreign-born citizens could never account for the success with which this order of politicians has diffused itself throughout the country. There is a deeper and stronger and more universal feeling which gives to it its astonishing success—that feeling originates in a fixed and living opposition to the Romish Church, not only because the convictions of our people are strongly adverse to its religious polity and tenets, but because the belief prevails generally that the members of that church recognise in its head a temporal power with authority to interfere with the secular affairs of kingdoms, republics, empires, and all other civil governments. With the religious aspect of the question we do not propose to meddle. We leave the discussion of that subject to the church, where alone it can be properly investigated.

The allegation that the Roman Catholic owes civil allegiance to the Pope is new neither in this country nor in Europe. When carefully scrutinized, we presume it will be found that the allegation had its origin and receives its corroboration from the ill-advised ambition of some of the Popes who sought to make their immense spiritual powers available in extending and enlarging their temporal authority. But if these were abuses of the pontifical position, as we are persuaded they were, they ought not to be relied on as establishing a doctrine of the church which has no other existence than in these occasional abuses of ambitious Popes. Our examination of the subject satisfies us that it is not, and never was, a recognised doctrine of the Catholic Church that the Pope had any authority whatever to interfere with the civil government of any people. His right to reign over his Italian dominions was not acquired by virtue of his spiritual office as Pope, but was the result of express grants of territory made to him by temporal sovereigns.

This is strictly a question of fact, which can be determined only by historical references. For centuries the charge was persistently made that the Catholic owed allegiance to the Pope of Rome, and therefore could not be a fit subject for holding official trusts in any other government. The charge has been as earnestly and constantly denied by the members of that church. In our own country it should be borne in mind that every alien who receives the benefits of our naturalization laws does so upon condition of taking an oath to support the constitution of the United States, and to renounce forever all allegiance to any other prince, power, or potentate. When Mr. Clayton, therefore, speaks of a man in our country who owes allegiance to a foreign potentate, he must either mean one who has never been naturalized—and in that view his position is unobjectionable—or he means that Catholics have emigrated to our land, and have become citizens by taking the oath prescribed, but yet that, in express violation of their oath, they recognise an allegiance to the Pope! This position involves a sweeping charge of perjury against tens of thousands of naturalized citizens whose lives have been a standing monument of their honesty and devotion to truth. We might well pause here and put the question with earnestness, Can any rational mind credit the suggestion that the thousands upon thousands of foreigners who land yearly upon our shores, and in due time swear to stand faithfully by our government, and who again and again have poured out their blood in defence of our national rights and honor—that these men perjured themselves when they swore that they forever repudiated and abjured

all allegiance to any power? The suggestion of such wholesale corruption is too revolting to be countenanced for a moment; and yet if Mr. Clayton's remark has any significance, he must have intended to convey the suggestion.

But a brief reference to the facts of history as they are furnished in Great Britain will throw a flood of light on this subject. It is a historical truth, which sheds no lustre on the pages of British history, that for centuries under the bloody and intolerant penal code of that country the Catholics were disqualified from holding office and subjected to the severest penalties for observing their religious rites, and persecuted with unrelenting and cruel ferocity. The only terms on which they could compromise with this intolerant proscription was to abjure Popery. They were willing to abjure Popery so far as his temporal or secular power was concerned; but the spirit of British intolerance demanded the abjuration of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. This was the vital point with the Catholics, and they chose for hundreds of years to submit to every species of suffering and persecution. Let it be remembered that they were willing to take an oath abjuring all allegiance to the temporal power of the Pope: they did not concede to him any such power, and they stood all the time protesting and asserting that the charge that they owed him allegiance as a temporal power was unfounded. When the Catholics appealed to the celebrated Pitt for relief against the cruelties of the penal laws, he replied that the chief difficulty was in the supposed belief of the Catholics in the temporal power of the Pope. It is exactly the same supposed belief of the Catholics of our country in the temporal power of the Pope which is at the bottom of the organization which seeks to resurrect and transplant from England the spirit of intolerance and persecution which disgraced that government for so many years. Mr. Pitt instituted an investigation into the fact whether, according to the Catholic creed, its members were bound to acknowledge allegiance to the Pope as a temporal potentate. He applied to the six leading Catholic universities of Europe for information, and to this end he addressed to each one the following questions:

"1. Has the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England?

"2. Can the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects, from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?

"3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature?"

These questions were sent for answers to the Catholic universities of Paris, of Douay, of Alcala, of Valladolid, and of Salamanca. These several universities were conducted by the most learned men of Europe, and they all responded with frankness and promptness to the questions. We have space only for the answer of one, though we have them all before us, and state that the answers of all are strictly the same. To show what they all answered, we select the response of the University of Paris, as follows:

Abstract from the answers of the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris to the above queries.

After an introduction, according to the usual form of the university, they answer the first query by declaring—

Neither the Pope, nor the cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil pre-eminence whatsoever, in *any* kingdom, and, consequently, none in the kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence by divine institution inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope, or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the sacred faculty of divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rigidly proscribed the contrary doctrines from her schools.

Answer to the second query. Neither the Pope, nor the cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any person of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the keys, absolve or release the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.

This and the first query are so intimately connected, that the answer of the first immediately and naturally applies to the second, &c.

Answer to the third query. There is no tenet in the Catholic church by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or those who differ from them in matters of religion. The tenet that it is lawful to break faith with heretics is so repugnant to common honesty and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants have complained more heavily than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them, &c., &c., &c.

Given at Paris, in the general assembly of the Sorborne, held on Thursday, the 11th day before the calends of March, 1789. [Signed in due form.]

The British mind was greatly relieved by these authoritative denials of the charge that Catholics owed allegiance to the Pope. The way to Catholic emancipation was opened, and in due time an act of Parliament was passed abrogating the cruel penal code, and giving to the Catholics the rights and privileges of subjects upon taking the oath of allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain. This oath was freely taken, and hundreds of thousands of Catholics have enjoyed the benefit of the act. If it be true that Roman Catholics owe temporal allegiance to the Pope, then it follows that all those in Great Britain, as well as in the United States, who have taken the oaths prescribed in the two countries, are guilty of constant and perpetual perjury.

In addition to the evidence on the question already adduced, we present to the reader an extract from a sermon delivered only a few days ago in New York, by Archbishop Hughes, before the provincial council of the Catholic Church, in which it will be seen that he distinctly and emphatically denies the allegation that the members of his church can or do owe allegiance to any other than our own government. The extract is as follows:

"Need I refer to the whole history of persecution to prove it? Under pagan Rome, for three hundred years, all the machinery of that vast empire was plied with cruelty to crush and extinguish the rising heresy of the Christian faith, and yet were Christians ever disloyal? They understand better the nature of their religion—of the religion of Him who taught them this principle: that the first duty which man owes is to his God, and the second to his country; and his country is the land in which he was born, or, if not, the land to which he pledges his solemn allegiance on oath. He is not free to be disloyal. It is of obligation to be loyal. It is the very principle of the Catholic church that a man's family has a third claim upon him, the second claim being that of his country; and for that country he must sacrifice property, and, if necessary, life itself. He knows but one country; he can recognise but one country; and, therefore, in the Catholic religion there is no such thing as the possibility of disloyalty to a land to which we owe our obligation. Need I refer to the last three hundred years' persecution under the British empire, during which time the same cry was kept up, and all who professed the Catholic faith were debarred from honors, subject to fines, and had their schools closed by supreme authority? And yet the reproach against them is that they were loyal, too loyal. Viewed, then, by the tests of history as exemplifying the spirit of the Christian church, is it possible that in a country in which we enjoy such advantages, in which the government declares itself impartially just towards all without knowing any distinction before the law, in which we are made equal, in which we have the liberty to assemble here in council—a privilege which we could not enjoy in some countries which call themselves Catholic—is it possible, I say, that in such a country we should not love the institutions and cherish them with an affection deeper than those who have been unable to make a comparison between this and lands and governments of bondage?"

If such testimony as we have adduced does not satisfy every unprejudiced mind of the groundlessness of the charge, that the Catholics acknowledge and owe allegiance to the head of their church as a temporal power, we are unable to conceive what would be satisfactory. It will be observed that we confine ourself strictly to the political aspect of the question; with its religious aspect we have nothing to do as a political journalist. We have entire confidence in the ability of the Protestants to discuss the points of religious difference between them and the Catholics; and so long as the controversy is confined to its legitimate limits, the cause of public morality will be promoted. If we have shown that the Catholics are not obnoxious to the charge of owing allegiance to a foreign potentate, we have destroyed the only pretence on which the Catholic creed can be made the subject of political controversies. The secret order of know-nothings must expect

to maintain their organization in the face of the plain provisions of the constitution, and upon the naked and startling doctrine of religious intolerance. On this issue the public mind may be agitated for a season, but the "sober second thought" will at length prevail, and the principle of civil and religious toleration will be more firmly established than ever. When this issue shall have run its career, and the Constitution shall have been fully vindicated, it will then be conceded that the democratic party acted wisely in the promptness and earnestness with which the great body of its members have set their faces against the know-nothing organization.

THE PROTESTANT PRESS SPEAKS AGAINST THE PARTY OF INTOLERANCE.

It is not wonderful that the religious press should become alarmed at the progress of this new fanaticism, which, in the name of God, seeks to destroy some of the dearest rights of man. It is no wonder that the Protestant church should be startled in its peaceful but prosperous and powerful advance by the attempt to originate a party which, if it did nothing else, must convulse this fair land of ours with popular tumults to which all that has gone before would be mere child's play; and this party is impudently *claimed to be the hero of the Protestant sentiment—the representative of all the anti-Catholic antagonisms.* It might almost as truthfully claim to speak for the Deity.

The New York Christian Inquirer, a religious journal of great influence and circulation, has an article which has been called out by the present condition of things. In its general view we most heartily concur. The vigor, the boldness, the originality, and the force of the article, will commend it to universal attention.

Still another evidence is furnished by the following intelligence regarding the action of that powerful denomination, the Lutherans:

'SECRET SOCIETIES.—The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio and the adjacent States, has passed a resolution not to admit to church membership any person belonging to secret societies."

Finally, we have the New York Churchman, the great organ of the Episcopalian church in this country. In the last number of that journal there is an article of three columns, from which we take the following powerful extract:

"The *know-nothing* agitation is precisely of the nature of those popular excitements which, when they gain full dominion over the public mind and heart, give birth to civil convulsions, blood, and crime. It has already in various places given rise to scenes of violence and disturbance of the public peace: and although we have no apprehension that it will go to the extent of unsettling the foundations of society, yet it is precisely that mixture of true and false ideas, salutary and pernicious principles, convictions of conscience and impulses of prejudice and hate, which all history teaches us are the stuff whereof such issues are wrought. * * * * We have no objection to the repeal of the naturalization laws and the limitation of the right of voting to native-born citizens—with a provision, if it be desired, for granting by special legislation that right, and also that of eligibility to certain offices, in special cases. But as to the rest, we have nothing but condemnation and reprobation to express of this whole *know-nothing* organization. This organization invokes to the polls the spirit of religious fanaticism and theological hatred. It proposes to wage a political war against the *Roman Catholics*—'war to the knife'—a war of extermination waged, as we understand, by political weapons. Hatred to the Roman Catholics, as such—this appears to be the deepest source and spring of this movement—this at bottom its most essential character. Now, we have nothing to say in favor of Romanism.

"We would do everything to check the progress of Romanism—to work, indeed, its utter extinction—that can be properly and fairly done. But we would put it down by the force of truth and argument, not by political proscription and persecution. Persecution is both wrong in principle and foolish in policy, as well as inconsistent with our eminent pretensions in behalf of religious freedom. Persecute any error of faith or opinion, and you make it grow; you increase the evils you see, the dangers you dread. Besides, if the *know-nothings* wage political warfare against Roman Catholic *foreigners*, how can they consistently help waging the same warfare against *native-born* Roman Catholic citizens? And how does that suit the genius of our institutions? How will the sense of the nation sustain that?"

* * * * * * * * *

"Last, but not least, among the reasons for reprobating this *know-nothing* organization, it is a *secret* association, league, or brotherhood. Any secret organization—no matter what its objects, no matter how good and important they may be—any such organization designed to accomplish its objects by acting on the elections, by wielding political power, is, in a free government, mischievous and dangerous. Such organizations are the very things most liable to become the terrible engines of fanatics and unprincipled villains. We want among us no Titus Oates Popish plots, no Lord George Gordon riots. They would disgrace the country and increase the power we would overthrow."

THE OBSTRUCTION TO JUSTICE FROM THE OATHS OF KNOW-NOTHINGISM.

The proceedings on a late criminal trial in Massachusetts have developed the startling fact that the obligations entered into by know-nothings came in direct conflict with the administration of the law in courts of justice. We copy so much of these proceedings from the Lowell Advertiser as shows clearly the practical workings of their oaths in affecting the credibility or competency of know-nothings as witnesses in court. When the witness takes the stand he swears that he will state "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." When asked the question whether he is a member of a secret order, and, as such, bound by an oath, if he answers that he cannot testify without criminating himself and subjecting himself to punishment, he is not a competent witness. If he answers that he is such member, and so bound by oath, he thereby violates the obligations of that oath, and discredits himself as a witness. In either point of view the administration of justice is obstructed and thwarted. This case exhibits know-nothingism in an entirely new light. We have heretofore regarded it as an engine of political and religious intolerance and proscription. The case in Massachusetts, however, shows that this was but a partial view of its enormity. The necessary consequence must be, that those who attach themselves to the order and assume its obligations become incompetent as witnesses, and, for the same reason, alike incompetent as jurors. No man will feel safe when his rights are to be determined upon testimony or upon verdicts proceeding from witnesses or jurors who are bound by oaths which disqualify them to act in either capacity. The result must be, that, whilst the know-nothings are combining to exclude naturalized foreigners and Roman Catholics from the full rights of citizenship, they will exclude themselves from the rights of witnesses and jurors. Thus it often happens that attempts to inflict wrongs on others, recoil and overwhelm the guilty. Without dwelling further upon the subject, we copy the proceedings which develop with such startling force the wickedness as well as the dangers of know-nothingism:

[From the Lowell Advertiser, October 28.]

KNOW-NOTHINGS IN COURT.—DISCLOSURES UNDER OATH.—At the criminal term of the court of common pleas, now being held in Lowell, Bishop, J., presiding, the following scene was enacted yesterday (Friday:)

The case on trial was the Commonwealth *vs.* Michael Reardon for rape; District Attorney Train for government, B. F. Butler and Daniel Needham for defendant.

H. C. Snow, of Groton, having testified for the government, Mr. Butler on cross-examination, asked him the following question:

Do you belong to a secret society, popularly called know-nothings?

Mr. Snow having denied that he did, and *stoutly persisting* in the denial, the question was put in a different form, when he was finally driven to the wall, and asked leave of the court to consult counsel. This liberty was politely granted by

Judge Bishop, who gave the jury a recess of ten minutes on account of the delay.

When Mr. Snow again took the stand, the question was again asked; upon which he promptly replied:

I cannot answer that question without criminating myself and subjecting myself to punishment.

Again and again was the question urged by the ingenious counsel for the defendant, every time assuming some new form, but being the same fearful visage to this disciple of the secret order, until at last, having detained the court more than two hours, and exhausted everybody's patience, he replied, "I do."

Question. How long have you belonged to it?
Answer. About four or five months.
Q. Is it a secret society?
A. It is.
Q. Did you take any oath or obligation in joining that society?
A. I did take an obligation.
Q. Was it in form of an oath?
A. I do not know.
Q. How was it administered to you; did you hold up your hand when it was administered?
A. I did.
Q. Did you call upon God to witness the obligation?
A. I think I did—"So help me God" were the last words.
Q. Are there different degrees in that society?
A. There are.
Q. How many have you taken?
A. Two.
Q. Does Dr. Norman Smith (a witness in this case) belong to that society?
A. I have seen him at the meetings.
Q. Have you ever seen John A. Gardner (another witness) at the meetings of the society?
A. I have.
Q. Have you ever seen Dea. John Pingree (another witness) at the meetings of the society?
A. I have.
Q. What is the form of the initiation?
A. I shall not tell, as it will criminate me and expose me to punishment.

Here the court remarked to the witness that he had a right to protect himself. If he had taken an oath contrary to law, he was not bound to criminate himself. But, said Judge Bishop, this is a startling revelation that men take obligations in secret societies which are regarded by them as of higher authority than those administered in this court.

A. M. Gage was then called. He testified, in a frank, humorous manner, that he once joined the order, but left it some three months ago. Mr. Butler called his attention to an exposition of an oath published in the Boston Post of October 25, which Mr. Gage seemed to think was about the kind of oath administered to him, though he did not remember exactly. From his testimony we judged that he had become disgusted with the order, and exposed its secrets without any misgivings.

Dr. Norman Smith called.

Q. Do you belong to a secret society opposed to aliens?
A. I do; to a society which is calculated to exercise a political influence?
Q. Does it not also exercise a religious influence?
A. Some think it does.
Q. Can a Roman Catholic join that society?
A. Not if he is a foreigner.
Q. Can he if he is an American-born citizen?
A. No.
Q. Can he if his wife is a Catholic and he a Protestant?
A. No.
Q. What is the object of the society?

The doctor, drawing himself up to his full height, and extending in a statesman-like manner his right arm, replied, with great eloquence, "To protect our liberty, sir!" at the same time bringing his right hand, with great violence, down upon

the judge's bench, and making the court-house echo with the sound of his hand as well as the music of his voice.

Q. What is the form of the initiation, and what the character of the obligation you take?
A. I cannot tell.
Q. Why?
A. Because I have bound myself not to.
Q. But have you not sworn here before this court to tell the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
A. I shall not unless I am obliged to.

The court here asked the witness if he thought by answering he would expose himself to punishment; to which he answered, Yes.

Q. Did you assist in getting up the lodge at Groton?
A. I did.
Q. Are you an officer in the lodge?
A. I am.
Q. What office do you hold?
A. I cannot answer that question without criminating myself, and *exposing myself to punishment.*

LET THE SOUTH SEE TO IT!

There is not now in the free States, outside of Greeley, (who quarrels with the know-nothings simply because Mr. Seward had been too far committed to the adopted citizens to recover in time,) a single abolition whig paper that is not openly in favor of the new know-nothing party. It is true the Boston Atlas, a whig paper, denounces them, and only because they defeated one set of enemies of the South to put in another and a more proscriptive set. But begin with the Ohio State Journal, a notorious abolition journal, and the Philadelphia North American, the able opponent of constitutional doctrines, and take up the followers and the echoes of these journals in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, including Maine, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Hampshire, and you will find that the prints whose staples of abuse for years past have been the institution of slavery, and those who have stood by the southern States, are at this moment the organs and oracles of know-nothingism.

Nor has know-nothingism yet chosen a single Union whig or Union democrat to the national legislature.

It has, however, defeated some of the most fearless and self-sacrificing spirits of the North.

It has superseded and intensified the abolition party by building up an organization controlled by abolition sentiments, political proscription, and religious intolerence.

It rallies under its dark banner the same voters who have constituted the bone and the sinew of the great anti-slavery party.

But we do not speak without the evidence. The New York Evening Post, a print that has been discarded by the democratic party for its fanatical hostility to the people and the interests of the South, gives us the following information on the subject:

"The notion, therefore, that it will be converted into a grand fusion, Union-saving, constitutional party, on the Castle Garden model, is destined to prove a delusion, though it seems to prevail in certain very respectable quarters. Without exception, the men whom it has elected to State or national offices are taken directly from the mass of the people, and not from the politicians, *and on the great question of the non-extension of slavery adopt, to the full extent, the prevalent northern view.* They are not generally men of experience or acknowledged capacity, but, at all events, on the question they answer the purpose for which they were chosen; they represent the views of their electors. *The moment the know-nothing organiza-*

tion fails to harmonize with the great sentiment which has now taken an enduring hold of the free States, that moment it loses its vitality.

"We are informed that the design is entertained of throwing off its disguise and calling a national convention to start a great American party. A declaration of principles is pretty sure to be the result, and such a document it will be difficult to frame so as to secure a unanimous and cordial support. By discarding its present distinctive character, it will lose its strongest charm, besides exposing itself more prominently to its assailants."

This view is, beyond controversy, correct; and if it were necessary to confirm it, we might refer to the letter of the new governor of Massachusetts, Mr. Gardiner; to the well-known avowals of the whig governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Pollock; to the opinions of Mr. Howard, who defeated that fearless advocate of constitutional principles, Hon. D. Stuart, of Michigan; to the secretly-chosen whig successor of the gallant Macdonald, of Maine; to the whig successor of the intrepid Dr. Olds, of Ohio; to the late exciting contest in Illinois; and in every case we could prove that when the know-nothings have elected a whig to office—and the Bulletin can see for itself how many democrats the secret order has elected—it has taken care at the same time to select an abolitionist, and to rejoice, with exceeding joy, over the downfall of the experienced and well-tried champions of the rights of the States. In a word, the abolition voters are not dead; and the Bulletin will find, that if these voters send new men to Congress, they take care also to send only those who are the enemies of the South.

WARNING WORDS FOR THE SOUTH.

That there is not a single prominent democrat in the North known as the advocate of the constitutional rights of the States who is not the avowed and persistent enemy of the know-nothing party.

That of all those elected to Congress by the know-nothings of Massachusetts, every one is committed to the most ultra-abolition doctrines.

That of all those elected to Congress in New York by the know-nothings, they are either the warm friends of Mr. Seward, or they were the active and unscrupulous adversaries of the Nebraska bill.

That there is not a whig elected in Ohio by the know-nothings, (and the delegation elected to the new Congress from that State is whig, with two or three exceptions,) there is not one that does not second and support the doctrines of the extreme abolition leaders.

That in Michigan every whig chosen has been elected by the know-nothings, and is the pledged opponent of the South, and the pledged adversary of the doctrine of admitting no more slave States, is a fact beyond all disputation.

The same may be said of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Illinois. These allegations may be defended and established by names and antecedents.

Take next the friends of the constitutional rights of the South who have been defeated in the North by the know-nothing organization. In Maine we have seen the veteran Parris, a consistent national democrat, defeated by the candidate of the know-nothings and abolitionists, John M. Wood. In Michigan, that fearless and out-spoken advocate of nationality, Hon. David Stuart, has been defeated by Howard, an unequivocal abolitionist and know-nothing. In Ohio, the intrepid Dr. Olds has been overborne by the notorious abolitionist and know-nothing, Galloway. In Pennsylvania, Hendrick C. Wright, Charles Shaler, W. Montgomery, and other avowed advocates of national doctrines, have been defeated by the candidates of the know-nothings and the abolitionists. In New Jersey, Dr. Lilly and General John S. Darcy, both standing upon the principles of the constitution, have been defeated by the know-nothings and abolitionists. In Indiana, Messrs. Dunham, John G. Davis, Hendricks, Eddy, and others, all devoted friends of State rights, have been succeeded by abolitionists, elected by the know-nothing vote.

It is true that in some cases anti-Nebraska men have been defeated, but the South will bear in mind that in every such case two things have been proved: First, that the anti-Nebraska element (though not the abolition element) has been lost sight of, and that every anti-Nebraska man who has been defeated has been, with a very few exceptions, succeeded by a rank and fanatical abolitionist!

So that know-nothingism, if it has done one thing more than another, has *swelled the ranks of abolitionism in the North, and has added largely to the power and the organization of the abolitionists in Congress.*

If the gallant and courageous Senator Dodge is defeated in Iowa, it will be by know-nothing votes.

If the notorious W. F Johnston, of Pennsylvania, or the no less decided and committed enemy of the South, Robert T. Conrad, or the abolition leader, David Wilmot, is chosen to the United States Senate by the legislature of that State, know-nothing votes will do the work.

General Shields, defeated for re-election in the Illinois legislature, owes that defeat to the combined forces of know-nothingism and abolitionism.

And at this moment a notorious abolitionist, General Wilson, sits in the United States Senate, where he has been sent by the know-nothing legislature of Massachusetts.

Let the issue of "no more slave States" be made upon the next Congress, and the South will see how much it has gained by the fusion between know-nothingism and abolitionism. We shall then behold such an array of fanaticism in the national legislature as has never before been equalled. And to this fanaticism who will oppose themselves? We answer, the true national democracy in Congress and the united South. Nothing can prevent this latter result but the adoption by the southern people, misled by ambitious leaders, of know-nothing representatives and know-nothing doctrines.

Let not the people of the South believe for a moment that because the "fusion" have sent many new men from the North into the next Congress, therefore abolitionism has not been strengthened. It is a change of name alone, but the heart and the brains of abolitionism are alive and controlling; and those new men are as much identified with the anti-southern element as they are with their own secret committals and ceremonies. THE SUCCESS OF KNOW-NOTHINGISM HAS BEEN THE SUCCESS OF ABOLITIONISM IN THE FREE STATES; and if the South seconds this secret order, it aids and strengthens its own mortal enemies.

Mr. Seward, however, is a convenient pretext for southern politicians who are eager to innoculate that portion of the Union with the new doctrines. All the facts and all his history go to show that Mr. Seward has played a bold game by assuming his present attitude against the know-nothings. His organ, the New York Tribune, has not hesitated to abuse the adopted citizens whenever they have voted in a body against the whig party; and he himself is on record for having declared that he was willing to exchange the Irish and Germans of New York for the free negroes of Virginia—a declaration which Gov. Smith, of Virginia, (now a representative in Congress from that State,) has repeatedly offered to prove. Any party, any idea, any expedient, any desperate manœuvre, will be accepted—any opinion deserted, *but that of abolition*, the moment Mr. Seward sees there is a chance to break up the democratic party.

Besides, know-nothingism is the evanescent exhalation of the day and the hour. So soon as the country sees that it cannot affect the right of suffrage to future adopted citizens by repealing the naturalization laws; so soon as the democrats in the secret order are convinced that they are overruled by abolitionists and whigs, and called upon to vote all important offices to worn out party hacks; so soon as the increase in a persecuted church is seen to be the result of the present religious proscription, it will pass away and be forgotten. *But the abolitionists it has elected to Congress will remain, and W. H. Seward will be publicly hailed as their champion.* In a word, abolitionism will not die when know-nothingism is extinct;

but it will remain in the field master of the machinery it has combined to use so recklessly and so triumphantly.

WHAT OTHER EVIDENCE DOES THE SOUTH DESIRE?

John P. Hale has been admitted into the secret order in New Hampshire. He is accompanied by Fogg and most of those who, in 1852, assailed President Pierce for being hostile to the Catholics! Hale and Fogg are now the chosen leaders of an organization pledged to hunt down every Catholic by means of the most cruel disfranchisement, and to shut out that emigration which has made the soil of New England the home of enterprise and of plenty. But the know-nothing lodges are chiefly acceptable to Hale because they enable him to concoct in secret those baleful plans for the overthrow of the Union, to which the best years of his life, and all his energies of body and mind, have been unremittingly devoted.

If this fact is not a sufficiently powerful evidence of the abolition character of the secret conspiracy of know-nothings, the circumstance that every legislature which is controlled by them in the free States, and that has recently been organized has chosen abolition whigs to its high offices, should be conclusive upon every honest mind. In Pennsylvania, the speaker of the house is a known abolition leader. In Illinois, both branches of the legislature are presided over by the same class of politicians; and in Maine it is the same. In Delaware, the State which Mr Clayton represents in the Senate, both the leading officers of the newly elected legislature are bitter and proscriptive whigs of his own school; and they will be found earnestly co-operating with him and his know-nothing associates, Hale, Thaddeus Stephens, and Henry Gardiner. No matter how Mr. Clayton may seek to disguise the abolition tendencies which control the secret order, (and this to a much greater extent than it ever controlled the whig party, now merged into it,) the fact that the avowed objects of their organization are evanescent and temporary and that hostility to the institutions of the South is an undying hatred of the most implacable character, cannot be reasoned away. When the secret lodges are broken up—when the present oaths and orgies are superseded—there will remain a solid and compact body of abolitionists and their dupes, who will at once proceed to carry out the work of the fanatics that lead them. When anti-masonry, to which the most of those now so eager for secret societies were attached, passed from the political stage, the machinery and the men of that organization fell into the hands of the whigs. When the great bank party was shattered to pieces, most of the democrats who went off on the then prevailing clamor remained with the whigs. The factions that leave the democracy always go to the next strongest party. Heretofore that has been the whig party, but now it is a secret order, pledged to the most inquisitorial proscriptions; and in a few months it will be the abolition party alone. This is the true philosophy that teaches by example.

What other evidences of the objects of the new party does the South want? Will the people of that section of the country wait to realize their peril by letting know-nothingism take root in their midst? or will they take time by the forelock and protect themselves before it is too late? Will they see the democratic party struggling with this monster proscription and hold their hands? The defeat of those who contend against it may continue for years, but the great glory of waging such a war is reward enough to a brave and conscientious citizen; and the South will find that the advantages of present acquiesence to a dominant fanaticism will never compensate for the disgrace and shame that will punish such indifference.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer.]

1852, 1854—AN EXTRAORDINARY CHANGE OF FRONT—DISHONESTY OF THE WHIG OPPOSITION.

We think the democratic press has been negligent of its duties in not taking more pains to show up the change in front which our political opponents have made within the last two years upon the questions which are now engrossing a good degree of public attention. Never in the annals of politics did a party veer round in so short a time, and preach such opposite doctrines, as the whigs have within the last two years. It is really most extraordinary; and he who allows his memory to revert back is struck with astonishment at the audacity and celerity with which the whigs have shifted their position. How their politicians and editors can hope to retain a share of public respect, in view of recent occurrences, it is impossible to conceive. It is a wonder how any person can have any emotion than that of disgust for a party which would be guilty of such dishonesty. The facts we are about to state no intelligent man will deny, for they are fresh in the recollection of every citizen of the country. Their bare recital, without any rhetorical adornment, indicates the utter recklessness and dishonesty of the party which is opposed to the democracy of the United States in a most striking and effective manner.

The principal objection made by the whig press and the whig organization to General Pierce, the democratic candidate for president in 1852, was, that he had not, although a prominent and influential politician, succeeded in blotting out from the constitution of New Hampshire a provision which excluded Catholics from holding certain offices of honor and trust. With the upholding of this religious test the whig editors and whig stumpers sought to connect the democratic nominee. The injustice of any such exclusion of Catholics formed the staple of most of the whig speeches and most of the whig editorials in the presidential campaign of 1852. How ardently and eloquently did that party then advocate the great and glorious doctrine of civil and religious liberty for all! What homilies upon the iniquitous character of this political proscription for religious opinions—discrimination against Catholics—were to be found in the Washington National Intelligencer, Louisville Journal, New York Courier and Enquirer, Philadelphia North American, Baltimore American, Cincinnati Gazette, Columbus Journal, Cleveland Herald, Hartford Courant, St. Louis Republican, Pittsburg Journal, Detroit Advertiser, Chicago Journal, and the whole crowd of lesser lights of the press that followed in the wake of these whig luminaries! Take up the files of any whig paper from June to November, 1852, and you will observe in them innumerable articles against the proscription of Catholics from office in New Hampshire, and attacks upon the democratic party and its candidate for countenancing the injustice.

Now all the above papers, and nine-tenths of the party that declared against any political disabilities being placed upon Catholics in New Hampshire, are anxious to extend the provisions of her constitution to all the States, and are connected with secret societies having that end in view. What a new light has suddenly broke in upon the vision of whiggery within two seasons! Those who were against Catholic exclusion from office in 1852 were know-nothings of 1852, astounding to relate. But this is only an exposure of one branch of the glaring dishonesty and shameless conduct of the whig opposition. In 1852 the same party and the same papers were in favor of the present naturalization laws, with an amendment proposed by their presidential candidate, to be incorporated in their national platform, that would have made those laws still more liberal to the foreign immigrant. Now they are in favor of repealing or extending them to the term of twenty-one years. It is evident, if there is any danger to be apprehended to our institutions from extending the right of suffrage to those not born on the soil, it was just as apparent in 1852 as in 1854, nothing having occurred since to alter in

the least the complexion of the question. Yet the whig papers and the whig party did not see it then, being singularly blind at that time to an evil which they now pretend has existed for a long period.

The great mass of the whigs who now compose the know-nothing secret councils in 1852 were the staunch supporters of General Scott, the man who was somarraptured with the "rich Irish brogue" and the "sweet German accent." To court and honeyfuggle the foreigners was then all right in the estimation of these precious whig patriots, and they made love to them in the most ardent manner. Now they are sworn enemies, and would proscribe and politically disfranchise them. The truth is, as an organization, the whig know-nothing opposition is utterly devoid of principle, and will take any tack and do anything that it thinks will beat the democratic party. What it professes one year it will denounce the next, paying no more attention to honesty or consistency than if those words were not to be found in the English language.

A PRACTICAL ILLUSTRATION OF KNOW-NOTHINGISM.—A SCENE AT INDEPENDENCE HALL.

The scene we are about to describe has the appearance of being natural enough if we make allowance for the lapse of time, and is certainly capable of being profitably construed. At all events, there is more than mere poetic justice in one of its features, because it recalls good deeds for the purpose of sustaining good principles.

The now chief magistrate of a beautiful and extensive city—occupied by half a million of human beings, and remarkable for its healthy location, its happy poor, its generous, rich, its scholars and its wits, its statesmen and its lawyers—held a high levee at Independence Hall—the Mecca to the freemen of America—the Panthcon to which the eyes of the whole world are turned either in hope or in fear. It was a spectacle of surpassing grandeur, and was in itself one of the epochs of the age. The object of this assemblage—for it included men who lived in the last century, and who re-appeared at this moment upon the stage of life to take part in the august ceremony—was to initiate an era of new measures, and to open the way to a future, such as never was "dreamed of in our philosophy." Judge Conrad had taken the seat which, nearly seventy-eight years ago, was appropriated by a man called John Hancock, who presided over a convention, held in that very hall, to cut the American colonies loose from the British crown, and who stood by and saw his place occupied by a stranger, who was ubout to improve upon the idea proclaimed in the Declaration of American Independence, and to set an example to posterity which those men who lived a hundred years ago had come from their narrow homes to dignify by their presence, and to hear the new doctrine expounded and illustrated. The principle upon which Judge Conrad administers his official duties was to be practically applied, and from the vast crowd before him he was to choose his assistants for the coming two years. No CITIZEN OF FOREIGN BIRTH could be considered a moment after that fact became known!

The roll was called. The first name was that of Gilbert Motier de Lafayette. "What are your claims to consideration?" was the question of the learned Judge Conrad.

"They are very few in number," said a musical voice in broken English. "I first fought at the Brandywine, a lovely stream in Chester and Delaware counties, and was wounded for the good of the cause. I did some service at Monmouth. I induced France to help the colonies with money and with men. I aided in compelling Cornwallis to surrender, and was present at the siege of Yorktown. I enjoyed the undiminished confidence of George Washington."

"Where were you born?" said Judge Conrad, glowing with enthusiasm at these eloquent and soldier-like details. "I was born in France, in 1757," was the response. "How?—a foreigner—an unnaturalized citizen," was the indignant interruption. "STAND BACK. These are days when all acts done by such men are forgotten and denounced. You are excluded from consideration by a grateful republic."

"Call Benedict Arnold, and let us hear his sentiment," was the next observation.

A voice replied: "I fought for my country long and well; but in an evil hour I deserted and betrayed her to the English. I was born in Connecticut in 1740."

"That is sufficient, brave and worthy son. Your case is already decided in your favor. I will enrol your name high in the list of my officers. It is enough that you were born in this happy country. We will now consent to hear from Baron Steuben."

A voice answered: "My name is Frederick William Augustus Baron Steuben. I gave my property, and the best years of my life to the cause of American Freedom. I fought at Stony Point, at Paulus Hook, at Yorktown, and was, I hope, of great use to George Washington. I was born in the Old World one hundred and fourteen years ago." "Another foreigner! Stand back, retire—your appeal is denied—your petition rejected. Call Hugh Mercer." To this name a voice replied as follows: "I come from the grave to meet you here, and speak for one who died for your country on the field of Princeton. I died almost in the arms of Washington. I was born in Scotland." "Enough—your example can produce no effect upon me; for I have vowed before Heaven to consider no claim, and to venerate no character when presented by a foreigner."

The name next on the list was that of Aaron Burr.

"I have no right to expect promotion in this hall sacred to the liberties I intended to destroy. I was born in New Jersey in 1756."

"We cannot do without the services of such a man," was the reply. "We forget your infamy and forgive your crime, born, as you were, upon the soil of America."

Such, without continuing these examples, is the plain and practical meaning of the new secret society which has been established among us, and which is based upon the *pseudo* patriotism which erects a barrier against large classes of our countrymen, and recognises a rule which, broad as it is, can only be sustained without making exceptions for or against any one. The most eminent virtues and deservings are rejected contemptuously, if he who can boast of them should not be a native born. On the other hand, the advantage of being born in the United States may cover and conceal a multitude of sins.

TWO INCIDENTS OF HISTORY.

"During the American revolution, a band of Irishmen were imbodied to avenge, in the country of their adoption, the injuries of the country of their birth." They constituted the great proportion of the Pennsylvania line. They fought with enthusiastic bravery for the cause of the colonies. Many of the so-called "native-born" citizens in the army were well provided and contented; but these gallant foreigners were not so fortunate. They were half-starved and almost naked. They appealed for relief, and in vain. They felt indignant at this treatment. They had arms in their hands, and they had reached that limit beyond which forbearance ceases to be a virtue. They now demanded what before they had solicited. At this moment the intelligence of their dissatisfaction was carried to the British camp, and was received with undissembled joy by Lord Howe. Here was, he thought, a glorious opportunity of crushing the embryo republic forever. He knew that the Irish character was irascible and impetuous. Messengers were despatched to the suffering and protesting Irishmen. Free pardons, gold, clothing, bounties, &c., were offered in one royal *carte blanche*. But there was no hesitation among these humble and starving foreigners. The degrading offers of the English chief

aroused at once their anger and their self-respect. There was not one *Arnold* among these hardy men. They scorned the tempters who had been sent to seduce them, spurned the glittering bribes, and gave up the British emissaries to the hangman's rope.

But there is another picture. When the Mexican war broke out on this side of the Rio Grande, nearly the entire regular army was composed of foreigners and adopted citizens. How they fought, and fighting fell, the history of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma will tell. The war progressed; and the native-American press predicted that the moment the Catholic Irish found themselves in Mexico, where Catholicity is the common and the established belief, they would go over to Santa Anna in clouds. History will say how false the prophecy proved to be. The adopted citizen was among the first on every field during that long and brilliant struggle. Whether following his leader at Buena Vista, at Monterey, at Cerro Gordo, at Molino del Rey, or at Chepultepec, he was rarely found wanting. It is true there was an exception in the case of Riley and his companions, who were fearfully punished in the face of the whole army, amid the execrations of their indignant countrymen. But there were also exceptions among the native Americans in that war, no less discreditable, and much more numerous. Who volunteered for the war more promptly and more enthusiastically, from the first to the last, than the adopted citizens, and especially the unnaturalized foreigners? Who repudiated the proffers of Santa Anna, in his fulsome proclamations, more indignantly than these same foreigners? Attended by their courageous priests in the midst of the shock of war, and dying with their hearts fixed upon their faith and their flag, they never murmured at the country of their choice, but rejoiced that they were able to defend her honor. When the conflict ended, there was not an American general who did not everywhere applaud the gallantry and the devotion of these soldiers of liberty; and the vain clamors of political native-Americanism were hushed before a spectacle which has passed into history, alike as a lesson and an example to after time.

GEORGE III AND THE KNOW-NOTHINGS.

The men who arraigned George III in the Declaration of American Independence were *specific* in their charges, as they were *open* in their avowal of them. Their bill of indictment contains twenty-eight distinct counts, among the earliest of which is the following:

"He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of land."

The authors of the constitution were imbued with the spirit of the Declaration They knew how power tended to abuse, and they guarded all their grants of it by cautious limitations. They knew in what they had suffered from tyranny, and there were certain rights which they meant to secure to themselves and their descendants. They understood the value of free religion, free speech, and a free press, because they had not always *had* them; and the privilege of assembling publicly to discuss public abuses was with them all the more dear, in consequence of the difficulties which in some periods of their history they had seen attending it. They granted away no authority to government to interfere with any of these rights But their constituents were not satisfied with this. They meant to leave nothing to implication when they felt their dearest interests involved. So the constitution was amended as soon as formed; and whoever desires to understand what our fathers valued most as *personal rights*, should read the first ten amendments of the constitution. The first article is itself a noble summary of political wisdom. We subjoin it for the refreshment of our readers:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Nearly all the other amendments look, as this does, to the personal security and rights of the citizen. He is not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; he is to have the right of trial by jury; in criminal cases he is to be confronted in open court with the witnesses against him, and to have benefit of counsel; he is to be allowed to keep arms; his house is to be a sanctuary to him, and is not to be invaded except upon warrant, and this issued upon probable cause, supported by oath. The citizen is to have fair play on all sides. He is protected against wrong, whether it comes from his neighbor or from the government. And as a safeguard against wrong, it is evident that PUBLICITY was a prominent idea with the framers of the constitution. No inquisition, no star chamber, no secret tribunals of any kind, did they provide for; but for open churches and public courts, and liberal speech and an unfettered press. These were the rights they cherished; and for these, as well as against such abuses as the Declaration describes, they fought Great Britain.

THE DOCTRINES OF NATIVE-AMERICANISM FORBIDDEN BY THE BIBLE.

All history furnishes irrefragable attestation that the most dangerous and wicked crusades against the imprescriptible rights of man have often been conducted under the auspices of a professed devotion to the sacred and benign tenets and doctrines of religion. Christianity itself has been prostituted, by bold and bad men, to the subversion of the inalienable privileges of the many, and the inspired oracles of Heaven's eternal King have been dragged into the arena of political strife, and employed as an instrumentality in the promotion of the purposes of sordid and unchastened ambition. The mad career of native-Americanism and its still more mercenary and corrupt ally, know-nothingism, furnishes an additional illustration of the desperation into which misguided and corrupt men will permit themselves to be hurried when they have selfish and ignoble purposes to subserve. The pretext for these two organizations, kindred in the dangers which they threaten to our political and social welfare, is one in which the *religious* element bears a very conspicuous part. The plea is that the Bible is excluded from our common schools, that the purity and freedom of Divine Revelation are seriously endangered, and that it demands the Argus-eyed vigilance of a secret and confederated band of natives and know-nothings to prevent the oracles of God from falling into disuse and disrepute. In a word—"tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon"—these new-fangled secret conspirators have impiously and presumptuously set *themselves* up as the defenders, *par excellence*, of the lovely and heaven-descended religion of the "meek and lowly" Jesus, and would fain impress all the world and "the rest of mankind" with the conviction that *they* have been singled out by Providence as the peculiar guardians of that blessed system of doctrines and truths promulgated by the Redeemer of the World! Every one of them, indeed, claims to be not less than another Gustavus Adolphus, with his significant title of "*Lion of the North and Bulwark of the Christian Faith!*"

But mark, now, how plain a tale shall serve to humble the lofty pretensions of these deluded and dangerous men in the dust. The doctrines of native-Americanism, so far from being in correspondence with that Bible of which they wish to be regarded the *exclusive* advocates, are expressly and significantly forbidden by the teachings scattered in rich profusion over its sacred pages. Already in the day of MOSES were the teachings of an exclusive and proscriptive *nationality* expressly repudiated and forbidden by this eminent and inspired Jewish lawgiver. Among the laws enacted by him for the regulation of the governmental policy of the people

of the Hebrew Commonwealth, we discover, bearing on the point, the following as recorded in the book of Leviticus, 19th chapter, 33d and 34th verses:

"If a *stranger* sojourn with thee in your land, *ye shall not vex him:* but the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you *as one born among you*, and thou shalt love him as thyself, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God.

We regard this section of the Mosaic enactments as directly to the point. With a sagacity amounting almost to intuition, this ancient and renowned lawgiver perceived how the very distinguished privileges conferred by a beneficent Providence on his countrymen would serve to foster in them a most morbid and dangerous national pride, subversive of the principles of genuine philanthropy, and utterly at war with that liberal and humane policy which it was the design of the Bible economy gradually to unfold and ultimately to extend over the entire habitable earth. Moses, it is plain to us, was profoundly skilled in the subtleties and deceitfulness of the human heart, and, looking with a prophet's eye through the dim vista of futurity, he clearly foresaw the time when his favored countrymen might wish to exclude the stranger and alien from any participation in those sacred and glorious blessings of civil and religious light and liberty, which, in comparison with other nations, in the advancing tide of providential development, should be copiously conferred upon them. Clearly did he forsee that a party of NATIVES might arise in his land, just as there has arisen one in ours, denying to the ALIEN, or to the emigrant from other lands, an equal participation in the same superabundant blessings, followed by a correspondent course of intolerance, proscription, and even inhumanity, unworthy the recipients of the especial favors of Heaven. This evil it was the determination of the Jewish lawgiver, at the very outset, to resist. He regarded his countrymen in the light of almoners of the same distinguished blessings to other nations. The light of the pure jurisprudence of Heaven was not to be circumscribed within the narrow limits of his own country, but its beams were to radiate gradually over the whole earth. As by a rebound from the Jews, the principles of an enlightened civil and religious polity—a pure and rational worship—were thence to inure to surrounding governments and people, and from a participation in these blessings none were to be excluded. The ALIEN, attracted by the beautiful lustre of such institutions into the Jewish empire, was not to be repulsed. He was not to be aggrieved nor *vexed*. On the contrary, he was to be welcomed into the land, and treated *as one born* therein! Beautiful system! worthy the pure and equitable jurisprudence of the skies! Oh! how it causes one's blood to rise in the veins, and one's flesh almost to quiver, to see it so sadly outraged and profaned by men claiming to be the advocates and defenders of the maxims, policy, doctrines, spirit and genius of the Bible! Oh, Christianity, numerous, sad, and deplorable are the outrages upon our common humanity committed in thy most sacred and excellent name!

KNOW-NOTHING JURIES.

"The gentleman from Mississippi, I think, intimated that there were to be some indictments, and a friend of his suggested that a Pennsylvania judge had charged a grand jury against the 'know-nothings.' Well, sir, these men have done nothing yet except to carry an election here and there, and that is not treason, even though a Pennsylvania judge did charge a jury that certain things could not be done, or ought not to be done, or were criminal in point of law. Sir, it is the people who are passing through these avenues, those who make judges and district attorneys, and they will take care of them all. They will take care of the juries and sheriffs as well as judges."—*Mr. Banks's speech.*

This is an extract from Mr. Banks's speech in defence of the know-nothings. It informs the public that juries hereafter are to *be taken care of.* What does the gentleman from Massachusetts *mean* by this? Have not the juries of this country been taken care of before? Has the republic been existing under its present constitution for more than three-score years, and are its juries now to be attended to for the first time? The constitution provides as follows:

"In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed," &c.

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the trial by jury shall be preserved."

In the different States of the Union there are *corresponding* provisions, and the statutes of the land do not fail to recognise the rights and duties of jurors by the most full and careful provisions. The trial by jury, however, is essentially a common-law institution. It is one of those muniments of freedom which came with our fathers from England. Lord Brougham once said that the whole machinery of the State was designed to bring twelve men into the jury-box to decide on questions connected with liberty and property. This is an exaggerated idea of its importance by an English peer; but it is none the less cherished as a safeguard of liberty by the American people. The juror among us is everywhere regarded as filling an important place, and exercising the gravest functions. The lives and property of his fellow-men are intrusted partially to his keeping. He deals with great interests. There is no man so high that he may not be brought before him, or so low as to be sure of escaping his judgment. The idea of corruption in such an officer is shocking to every mind. He is to be a "good man and true." He is to try the causes submitted to him "according to the law and the evidence." He is to be controlled "neither by fear, favor, nor the hope of reward." Proof that he has been tampered with, or has even been exposed to improper influences, is a cause for new trial. It is criminal to approach him with a bribe. While he deliberates, he is, as far as possible, kept from temptation. The jury-room is guarded by an officer. Nothing is left undone which seems likely to assist in securing to every citizen the right of fair trial by an impartial jury. An announcement that this trial cannot be had in the United States is sufficient to shock the public sense throughout the Union. To feel that the avenues of justice are interrupted is to feel that one of the great purposes of our government has failed. What, then, we ask again, does Mr. Banks mean by *taking care* of judges and juries? What is to be done with them? What novelty in judicial practice is to be introduced? What fresh method has been found of reaching the minds and consciences of those who sit on the bench or in the panel? Is the underground railroad to be connected with our courts of justice? Are jurors to be approached through the covered passages of the *secret order?* Are oaths to be administered to them in darkness which will control any other oaths they may take in the face of day? Are causes in court to be determined not upon their merits, but by the relations of the parties engaged to the know-nothing conspiracy?

CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND—INTOLERANCE AND BIGOTRY IN AMERICA.

For more than fifty years the doctrine of religious toleration has been successfully advocated in the English Parliament by the leading intellects of Great Britain. Such men as Brougham, McIntosh, Peel, and even Wellington, not to speak of Irish O'Connell and Shiel, have not hesitated to help the good cause. The reform has been gradual, but it has been sure. The disabilities under which certain denominations labored have been lessened—odious test-oaths have been modified—and a more liberal policy inaugurated. But is there not, we may be asked, an established church in Great Britain; and are not taxes wrung from those who worship at other shrines? True; but are we, in republican America, not only about to ignore that principle of religious toleration, which is older than our Declaration and our Constitution, *because it may be said to have been the parent of both*, but at the

same time to build up an organization far more objectionable than the established church—an organization by which men are forced to pay taxes, and yet are cut off from public office—an organization by which native-born citizens are condemned for their foreign-born fathers—an organization as tyrannical and as cruel in its oppression upon the minds of men as the Spanish inquisition itself. So that when we go back beyond the revolution to destroy the seeds from which that revolution grew, it would seem to be consistent that we should accept and consecrate those early wrongs of the English, of which they themselves have become heartily ashamed.

ABOLITIONISM TRIUMPHANT IN MASSACHUSETTS.

It turns out, after all, that it is abolitionism, and not know-nothingism, which has triumphed in Massachusetts; or, in other words, that of the two allies the former has proved the stronger, and consequently has maintained its ascendency. The meaning of the election by the house of representatives of General Wilson, by a majority of one hundred, will be fully comprehended when it is seen that the New York Tribune announces the result in the following exultant strain:

"Henry Wilson was yesterday chosen United States senator from Massachusetts on the part of the house by *one hundred* majority. The senate does not vote till the 31st instant, but there is little or no doubt of its concurrence.

"We did not expect ever to rejoice over the election of a know-nothing, but as on *that* head it was Hobson's choice this time, we *do* rejoice that the senator elect from Massachusetts is one who—as the hatred and ineffective malice of slave-catching hunkerism assure us—will never be found unfaithful to the cause of human freedom. A result so deeply deprecated by the Curtises and Halletts of Boston cannot, in the long run, prove other than beneficent."

The Boston Post places the result in its true light in the following comments:

"*The Senatorship.*—The election of Henry Wilson senator by the house of representatives may create great astonishment, but it ought to create no surprise. It is an event which has been predicted from the known predominance of free-soilism in the lodges of this State. It was this predominance which compelled the know-nothing gubernatorial candidate to write his free-soil, anti-fugitive-slave law letter, and that required of him so much free-soilism in his inaugural; and it is this element that now *commands* the election of the foremost free-soiler and anti-Nebraska man in the State to the great post of senator. Free-soilism worked hard to get the control of the lodges, and it works adroitly in laying hold of the substantial reward.

"Thousands, we have reason to believe, joined the order and worked with it in the tacit understanding that the old slavery question was to be put away, and that the order was to be a national institution. How much does this election look like *nationality?* Can there be picked out in the whole commonwealth a person who has spoken and written and managed more downright free-soilism than Henry Wilson? Can there be found a more decided opponent of the compromise measures of 1850? Can there be found a politician who will go further than he will go in pushing on the anti-slavery cause, and who is more strongly pledged to this course?

"What, however, has this well-known fact availed to check the purposes of the dominant majority in the lodges? This majority are deadly hostile to the compromise measures, and their object is to *repeal* them, at whatever cost; and no man who was not with them at heart, no man whom they could not implicitly trust, could have been elected by the house. The deceived portion of the order may cry out with astonishment, 'this is *not* the entertainment to which we were invited,' but it will do no good. They have parted with their votes, and this is their satisfaction.

"The letters published yesterday between Mr. Hall and Mr. Wilson are the most adroit specimens of political correspondence we have seen for a long while. In his letter the senatorial candidate takes back nothing of the past, alters not an iota his position, but leaves all his abolition vows as strong and as binding as ever; and if he goes to the Senate he will go there ready to fulfil all his former pledges. Indeed, he regards the know-nothing movement as auspicious to the friends of freedom—namely, the anti-slavery cause.

"It is said that the senate will undoubtedly concur in this choice of General Wilson. Then Massachusetts will be before the nation in almost as thoroughly a *sectional* attitude as it is possible for her to be, unless she should in future array herself in rebellion against the government. Such a position is deeply to be lamented by every friend to the constitution and every supporter of the Union. In the next Congress her delegation, in both branches, will be nearly unanimously FREE-SOIL. Not, therefore, to *her* counsels—not to *her* influence—will it be owing that peace will continue to prevail throughout our country. Should this action be imitated in other States, there is nothing more certain than that our land will be plunged into the deepest and most deplorable agitation; for such measures as the free-soilers are ready for—so unconstitutional are they—could not be triumphant in Congress without open resistance being made to them by one-half the States of this Union."

Mr. Wilson has since been elected to the Senate of the United States.

A GOVERNOR'S OATH.

The whig candidate for governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Pollock, is the sworn oath-bound member of this secret association. The democratic papers charge it upon him, and neither he nor his organs have the hardihood to deny it. The oath that he swore to, on entering this midnight conspiracy, is given in the Pennsylvanian as follows:

First oath taken by Pollock, whig candidate for governor of Pennsylvania, on entering the ante-room of the know-nothing order.

"You do swear by Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts, that you will not reveal or divulge any of the secrets of this order which you shall hear or see; and so you shall answer to God at the great day."

What the creed of this order is we have already shown. It is based upon the three ideas of hostility to a particular religion, hostility to adopted citizens, and hostility to our naturalization laws. Connected with these are various other doctrines no less narrow, contracted, and anti-republican. And to carry out such principles, to aid in such a crusade, we see a great party willing and ready to commit itself—its leader even sealing his devotion to it with a solemn oath!

"To what base uses may we come at last." The party led by Clay, and animated by his eloquence and his example, cheered by the sonorous tones of Webster, which rung like so many Milton-like anthems in its praise, to dwindle into a sort of appendage—to sell itself like a poor chattel—to be assigned, like a worthless character, to an organization whose prospects are so infamous that it hides them in the darkest recesses, and essays to keep them from the light of day by means of hideous oaths!

ABOLITION THE BACK-BONE OF THE NEW SECRET ORDER.

The idea that any great party can exist in the free States of this Union hostile to the democratic party, and yet not be indebted for its vitality and its numbers to the abolitionists, is a wicked absurdity. The foes of the slave States are no longer a despicable body of men. They have grown strong. They control States. They elect governors. They elect United States senators. They gather to their ranks all the discontents against the democracy, all the enemies of the constitution, every narrow reformer, every crack-brained theorist, every advocate of sumptuary laws, every religious fanatic; but they always contrive to keep the abolition chiefs in the advance, and the abolition politicians in the majority. There may be exceptions to the rule, as we have said before. Mr. Seward is not a know-nothing, *but he sends no enemy of know-nothingism into Congress!* If he does, name him to us. In Massachusetts we are told by certain know-nothing papers that the new party broke down the enemies of the South by defeating the whigs; but if they did, they sent a much more ultra delegation into the new Congress. And these, observe, *are exceptions.* What is the rule? Let us answer this by suggesting a few plain instances. Hon. Lewis D. Campbell, of Ohio, one of the ablest of the opposition in the present House, and one of the most decided opponents of the South

is supposed to be candidate for Speaker in the new House of Representatives. Yet he will expect the votes of the know-nothings. Nor will Mr. Haven, of New York, who likewise, it is said, desires to be our next Speaker, denounce the know-nothings. Will Mr. Matteson, an influential Seward whig, re-elected to the seat he now occupies—will he denounce the know-nothings? We think not. Will Mr. Washburn, of Maine, whose vigorous opposition to the Nebraska bill will not soon be forgotten—will he denounce them? On the contrary, all these gentlemen look to know-nothing votes in the future as their stay and their staff *at home*. But we sat down to call attention to a very remarkable article in the leading whig paper of New Jersey, the Trenton State Gazette, introducing another article from a Massachusetts whig paper of high repute, both of which show conclusively that know-nothingism is only abolitionism under another name; *thus establishing the rule*. We copy as follows:

[*From the Trenton (N. J.) Gazette.*]

There is published at Washington a newspaper called the American Organ, a self-constituted organ of the general American feeling of the country. It is proper to understand, however, that this is not the fact. That paper is not the organ of the American feeling anywhere. It is the co-worker for continuing the ascendency of slavery, a defender of the Nebraska outrage, and an advocate for the further extension of the odious institution. We warn the friends of American freedom against the specious arts of this new ally of the slave power in the guise of an American organ, and refer to an able article from the Worcester Evening Journal for an exposition of the only true doctrine on this great national issue:

[*From the Worcester Evening Journal.*]

AMERICANS AND SLAVERY.—One of the most interesting questions that are connected with the American movement is the inquiry as to what policy the party will pursue in regard to an institution that has completely disorganized and ruined the two old political parties, and which, it is strongly believed and predicted, will yet scatter to the winds what to-day is a mighty and irresistible political organization. We have already noticed that in the Senate, Adams, of Mississippi, has introduced a bill of the same character as that desired by the new party; while in the House, Barry, of the same State, has violently and bitterly attacked the whole party; and Henry A. Wise, the most insolent advocate of slavery that the South possesses, is also opposed to the whole movement. Another fact in this connexion should not be lost sight of—and that is, that the most popular man in the party, talked of as a candidate for the presidency, is an anti-Nebraska, heart and soul. But if we lacked positive proof of the feelings of the masses of the party in regard to slavery, the late elections in this and other States of the Union show the liberal tendencies of the whole party. In New York the American party polled 132,000 votes, but they aided the anti-Nebraska party in that State in returning to the next Congress twenty-nine men opposed to the admission of slavery into Kansas. In Pennsylvania we saw a like result; while in Illinois, by the aid of this movement, the Douglasites were completely routed; and so in Michigan, where the whole State was carried for freedom by the council-fires of the American party.

Since last April the American party have elected nine anti-Nebraska governors in as many States, seven of which last year had democratic executives. In our own State the party has sent to Congress six out-and-out free-soilers, while the whole State government is thoroughly anti-slavery. New Jersey furnishes also another strong proof of the tendency of the party, the Americans in that State returning four members to Congress in favor of freedom in Kansas and the restoration of the Missouri Compromise. The party has defeated almost every northern man that voted for the Nebraska bill, and it has completely revolutionized the House of Representatives; but for three years two-thirds of the Senate will be beyond its reach. Thus far the party has professed nothing, but silently, powerfully, and successfully

it has acted and given to freedom trophies that she may boast of so long as the republic shall last. The question here returns, Will this, so far, general avowal of the American party in behalf of freedom be carried out in a national campaign? We answer it will, and to prove the assertion we submit the following facts: first, the movement has thus far, and will prevail in all States possessing a foreign population; secondly, such States as the northern and western ones, and lately these States, now in the hands of the party, possess a majority of the electoral votes. The following States, we know, can be carried to-day by the American party, and we attach to each the number of electoral votes they are entitled to: Pennsylvania 27, Massachusetts 13, Maine 8, Delaware 3, New Jersey 7, Illinois 11, Indiana 13, Rhode Island 3, New York 35, Ohio 23, Connecticut 6, New Hampshire 6, Vermont 6—making in all 160 electoral votes, being eleven more than are required for the choice of President. *These figures show that, as a party, we are independent of any southern support whatever, and therefore the temptation or the necessity of bidding for southern votes does not exist, for the two great States of the Union are now secured to the American party.* Virginia and Maryland are sure to go for the American ticket; but, without the aid of a single vote from these almost northern States, we shall elect, in 1856, an American President. The slavery question cannot affect the American party, for its whole power and all its hopes are north of Mason and Dixon's line. Its aspirations are for freedom; and when the party is accused of being pro slavery, let its defenders point the men who utter the base lie to every election that has occurred since the party sprung into existence. We know it defeated Benton, because he pandered to the vile appetites and taste of the foreign vote of St. Louis; but in the North it has sent to the hall of Congress as able defenders of human liberty as he is—in fact, more so, for he is not in favor of restoring the Missouri Compromise. As to Clayton's views, we know of no journal that is American that ever endorsed them. The party never has, and we hope never will, fulminate anti-slavery resolves for the purpose of humbugging the masses, but it will do right, move right, and act right, and in every free State in the Union it will give new protection to every citizen within its borders. Its first great national aim is to procure an alteration of the naturalization laws, and upon that point they will know no sectional division; but upon the great question of freedom and slavery every northern American freeman will raise his voice for liberty, and Banks, De Witt, and Trafton, will utter upon the floor of Congress the sentiments of this new party. That foreign element that has given the pro-slavery democratic party the control of this country will soon lose the means of augmenting its numbers; and when that is effected, freedom in this republic is secure. The prize we are battling for is "liberty to all;" and when Americans rule America we shall obtain it, and not till then.

THE SOUTH MUST CHOOSE BETWEEN ITS FRIENDS AND ITS FOES. WILL IT DO SO?

The concurrent and emphatic testimony of all the notorious Know-Nothing leaders now in Congress from the free States, that the great first cause of the recent overthrow of the democratic party in most of the northern elections was the position of the democracy on the slavery question, so far as it was involved in the Nebraska bill, should arouse the people of the South like the fire-bell at midnight. When we see the whole whig party in the North lost in the combination of factions, or conquered by an overwhelming fanaticism, helpless to resist its masters, even if it were willing to do so, and at the same time behold the unanimity and the boldness of the leaders of the so called fusion party, we are solemnly impressed with the idea that, for the first time in American history, there is danger of at least one branch of the American Congress being controlled by the active and

uncompromising adversaries of the federal constitution, and the rights of fifteen sovereign States of this Union.

Nor does this belief depend simply upon the fact that the Know-Nothing leaders in Congress and the country unitedly declare that it was not hostility to foreigners or to Catholics that affected the recent contests, but an unconquerable hatred of the rights of the southern people. There is evidence more appalling; and that is, the declarations and the pledges made in all parts of the free States, and reiterated in the present Congress within the last few days, that the northern fusion party will demand the restoration of the Missouri compromise and the repeal of the fugitive slave law as soon as the next House of Representatives has been organized. The abolition leaders, as we have seen in New York and in Pennsylvania, having used religious prejudices to strengthen their hands, now that they fancy themselves secure in power, boldly throw off all disguise, and stand revealed as the covenanted enemies of the rights of the States, and committed to the support of the most revolutionary and anarchical acts of legislation. The last programme of Mr. Wilson, who has just been sent to the United States Senate by the know-nothings in Massachusetts, is the programme of this whole fusion party in every State west and north, and is as follows. We copy from the Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia North American of the 24th, and in the debate itself Mr. Wilson elaborates these grounds:

"He wishes the fugitive act repealed.
"He wishes slavery in the District of Columbia abolished.
"He wishes the Wilmot proviso established.
"He wishes all new slave States excluded.
"He wishes all connexion between the general government and slavery abolished.
"He wishes agitation of slavery continued until these objects are accomplished.
"He understands these views to correspond with those of the know-nothings as a party, so far as they have taken any position on the question."

These views, it will be remembered, are no longer the views alone of Messrs. Chase, Sumner, Wade, and Giddings. Know-nothingism, through the aid of crafty and plausible leaders, has made them the basis and the pillars upon which a conquering party has been erected; and now we hear them proclaimed by many representatives, who declare that they are the sentiments of their constituents. It would be profitless to dispute about the causes of this state of affairs. We give the fact as it exists, and direct attention to it as an immediate and an increasing danger.

Let us now ask, who is to arrest this threatening tide of organized and exultant fanaticism? Who shall say to this vast peril, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no further; here shall thy proud waves be stayed?" We see the South besieged by the triumphant abolitionists of the free States; besieged not, as heretofore, as enemies, *but under the guise and glass of a false friendship.* Messrs. Seward, Fessenden, Wilson, Washburn, and the rest, are just now as anxious *for their southern friends* as if the latter were their sworn and accepted associates. The prejudices of the southern people against the adopted citizens are artfully aroused and kept up by old whig leaders like Prentice, Botts, on Rayner, on the ground that the foreign-born citizen is generally hostile to southern institutions; and with this plausible appeal they hope gradually to conduct the whole South into the arms of the party already created it the North, *thus nationalizing know-nothingism, and making abolitionism irresistible at the same moment.*

Who, then, is to check and turn back this devastating torrent? The South is besieged by, and is said to be ready to yield to, its maddening current? Should the South capitulate, and the next House of Representatives fall into the hands of the party led by Wilson and Fessenden, by Seward and by Hale, there will be none left to meet the shock BUT A GALLANT MINORITY OF DEMOCRATS FROM THE FREE STATES, THE BRAVE FEW WHO HAVE ESCAPED THE CONFLICT WITH THE LOSS OF THE CONSTITUTION, AND WHO GO INTO THE NEXT CONGRESS TO BATTLE FOR THE ENDURING DOCTRINES OF STATE RIGHTS. What a spectacle it would be to see the

South captured by the combined fanatics of the North, and the fatal measures of abolitionism carried into effect with no voices to protest against them but a minority of northern democrats!

But there is time—there is a broad field before us yet. The South has been forewarned; will it be forearmed? Will it be fascinated by the serpent's wiles, and forget that it is invited to its own destruction? or will it take counsel from the facts? Will it be misled by the miserable humbug of know-nothingism—by illiberal prejudices and secret mummeries—and fail to see and act up to its whole duty in the premises? Never before was abolitionism at once so dominant and defiant. Never before was it so bold and so confident. Never before was its hellish schemes so publicly proclaimed, so carefully elaborated, and so warmly and ably advocated. *Never before, finally, has it dared ta ask the South to unite with it, proffering peace with one hand and death with the other.* It remains now only to see whether the South, in order to gratify the eager appetite of whig office-hunters for place and power, will destroy the democracy of the North by a formal union with the only other party of the country, and that party the party of abolitionism and persecution. This is the issue. Let the South choose for itself.

(From the Washington Sentinel.)

KNOW-NOTHING PLATFORM IN PENNSYLVANIA.

We publish below a letter of Simon Cameron, esq., of Pennsylvania, containing as loathsome an abolition creed as well could be gotten up. It will be borne in mind that Mr. Cameron is the candidate of the know-nothing party of Pennsylvania, for the United States Senate. It will also be borne in mind that the southern know-nothings have been boasting of his soundness on the slavery question, and holding him up to the country as evidencing the sound and orthodox views of their brethren of Pennsylvania. That the southern know-nothings may understand the character and designs of their northern allies, we spread before them the creed of the Pennsylvania know-nothing abolition candidate for Senator:

HARRISBURG, *February* 9, 1855.

DEAR SIR: I have, at 12 o'clock, received your letter of this morning, and reply to it immediately:

To your first interrogatory:

"Have you ever at any time been, or are you now, or will you ever be, in favor of the so-called Kansas-Nebraska bill, passed by Congress at its last session?"

Answer.—From the day it was introduced in the Senate to this time, I have been opposed to the bill, nor shall I ever favor it.

"2d. Would you, if elected to the Senate of the United States, use all honorable and fair means to effect the restoration of the so-called Missouri Compromise, which was literally and virtually abrogated by the passage of the aforesaid Kansas-Nebraska bill?"

I answer—I would.

"3d. Would you, if elected to the Senate of the United States, use all honorable and fair means in your power to effect a repeal of what is commonly known as the 'Fugitive Slave Law?'"

Answer.—The passage of the Compromise Measures was acquiesced in by the North, and I had hoped the questions growing out of it had been settled; but as the South has been the first to violate it, I hold the bill subject to revision, and will act with the North upon this and all questions connected with the subject of slavery.

I answer—I will.

"4th. Do you recognise the right of Congress, and if so, would you act upon such right, and use your vote and influence to legislate for all territories now be-

longing to, or which may hereafter be acquired by the United States, to the utter and entire exclusion of slavery or involuntary servitude in said territories?"

My answer is, that I recognise the right, and would so legislate.

"5th. Would you oppose, by all and every honorable and fair means in your power, the extension of slavery and involuntary servitude over territory now free, or anywhere or at any time, now or hereafter, wherever or whenever it may be endeavored by its friends to introduce it?"

For an answer to this, I could readily refer to my senatorial course—especially my vote on the Wilmot proviso; but that there may be no misunderstanding, I emphatically answer in the affirmative.

6th. "Would you at all times, and upon all occasions, protect and preserve inviolate in this respect, as in all others, the rights, immunities, and privileges of the North, as guarantied to them by our Constitution and laws, against any and all encroachments of our sister States, comprising and composing the Southern part of our National Confederacy?"

Answer.—A Northern man who would not protect and preserve the rights of the North is unworthy of the respect of any honorable man, and for those rights I would battle until the last, either in a public or private station.

"7th. Are you in favor of, and would you vote, act, and use your influence in favor of, such a system of public rates and duties as would most effectually, and beyond all doubt guard our home industry and manufacture against foreign competition and pauper labor?"

Answer.—My principles have always been in favor of the "American system." I have never doubted as to what was the true policy of the country, and I answer your interrogatory in the affirmative.

"8th. Do you still, in this respect, adhere to and abide by the sentiments and doctrines contained in the speech delivered by you in the Senate of the United States on the 19th day of July, 1846?"

Answer.—I most certainly do.

"9th. Do you recognise the right of Congress to legislate and make appropriations for the improvement of our rivers and harbors?"

Answer.—I do recognise the right—greatly deplore the Executive vetoes on this subject, and will use every means in my power for the passage of bills for the improvement of the rivers and harbors.

"10th. Are you in favor of such a change in our national laws pertaining to the naturalization of foreign citizens as will compel all of them arriving in this country, after the passage of such an act, to remain in this country at least twenty-one years before being entitled to the rights of suffrage as they now possess them, and will you use your influence to accomplish such a change?"

This, your last interrogatory, I answer in the affirmative.

It was noon when I received your letter. Visitors and friends have crowded my room since I commenced writing, or I should have written more in detail. Your inquiries were direct and to the point. Still I must regret that I had not time to elaborate them more fully.

Very respectfully, yours, &c.,
SIMON CAMERON.

J. M. KIRKPATRCIK, Esq.,
House of Representatives.

THE CONTEST IN VIRGINIA.

The deep solicitude so universally felt throughout the Union in regard to the issue in the coming election in Virginia may in part be attributed to the alarmingly rapid growth and spread throughout the free States of doctrines not merely opposed

to the principles of the democratic party, but which threaten to engulph in its deep, dark waters the Union, the constitution, the rights of conscience, civil and religious freedom—all that we venerate and cherish—all that has been bequeathed to us by the wisdom of our statesmen, and which has been sealed to us as a testament by the blood of our revolutionary martyrs. Through a union of men of all parties and of all principles, made for the time homogeneous by the leaven of know-nothingism, the democracy in Maine, in Pennsylvania, in New Jersey, in Ohio, in Indiana, in Michigan, in Wisconsin, and in Iowa, have been stricken down; and if Illinois has emerged from the contest victorious, she bears on her broad, proud breast the marks of a struggle desperately and closely contested. All eyes are now turned towards Virginia—turned towards that Old Dominion, whose beacon-fires have ever gleamed brighter and brighter as the democratic horizon became obscured by the flitting shadows of faction, or darkened by the thick-rolling clouds of a restless opposition. Will she fall, or even falter, in the path of duty? Will she, in the hour of need and peril, open the flood-gates, and let the deep red tide of fanaticism spend its force and fury upon the entire South? We do not wish to overstate our case, to exaggerate the strength of our enemies, or to diminish the extent of our own resources; but we have no hesitation in asserting, as our calm, settled belief, that so far as the South is concerned, if they are to be saved from the blight and curse of know-nothingism, that immunity from threatening danger can only be secured by the triumph of the democratic party.

The stake is so deep, and the alternatives so fraught with peril, that we are not at all surprised that out of Virginia, a feeling bordering on apprehension should be felt, and felt by those who have hitherto regarded the course of the democracy of that State with that unwavering confidence which a recollection of her past political history is so well calculated to inspire. After the nominations had been made by the Staunton convention, we were prepared for the slight ebullition of feeling which subsequently manifested itself in several portions of the State. Men have their preferences in political as well as social life, and when called into vigorous action by the fervor of friendship, they are not disposed to acquiesce without a murmur in the wishes of the majority, if those wishes run counter to their hopes or expectations. The majority principle has ever been a cardinal one of the democratic party; but to expect that those in full membership with that party should be superior to the ordinary feelings or failings of humanity, would be to suppose a state of political perfection which never has and never can be attained. Seldom, if ever, have the nominations of a State or national convention called forth universal commendation. Time must be allowed to heal the wounds of disappointment, and to cool the high wrought desires of the friends of the opposing candidates. Such has been the case in every State in the Union, and such has recently been the case in Virginia. At first we were told that Mr. Wise's nomination would not receive the united and cordial support of the democratic party—that such and such a leader, or such and such a paper, was either lukewarm or secretly hostile. Since the nomination was made, we have conversed with leading politicians from every section of Virginia, and have read with care the democratic journals published in that State, and, so far from discovering any evidence of that apathy or weakness which the enemies of the democracy alone have discovered, from what we have heard and read, we feel satisfied that Virginia will not prove recreant to duty, and, forgetful of an unbroken line of democratic triumphs, repose in fatal security in the lap of the modern Delilah.

The country knows what Virginia has done, and that the vital principle of democracy is as warm and strong now with her sons as in the days of Jefferson and Madison. The real issue now is, not simply the election of State officers the friends or the opponents of the democratic party, but whether democratic principles are to be firmly and proudly upheld, or whether the enemies of the constitution and the laws are boldly and recklessly to trample under foot all that we regard as being inseparably connected with the safety and perpetuity of our free institutions. We have an abiding confidence in the steadiness, the truth, the strong common

sense, and conservative spirit of the great democratic party of Virginia. For upwards of half a century she has never once hesitated to give way—never once disappointed the high expectations reposed in her. In cloud or sunshine, in prosperity or adversity, in the pride of conscious strength, or when the country has been convulsed with the throes of maddened and successful faction, Virginia has ever presented to the national democracy the same calm, self-relying, unconquerable front. It does not come within the range of possibility, that at this time, and at an emergency so fearful, and with the eyes of the whole nation fixed upon her, she will surrender her name and fame to the infamous keeping of know-nothingism.

THE RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE TO ADOPTED CITIZENS NOT A MATTER FOR CONGRESSIONAL, BUT STATE ACTION.

The idea which the leaders of the new secret order hold out to those who are not willing to approve their bigoted crusade against the liberty of conscience in its relations to religion, and yet who are anxious to see the naturalization laws modified and reduced, is, that the only way to secure this result is to *nationalize the know-nothings, and to control a majority in Congress.* Many sensible men, who indignantly repudiate the clandestine meetings and relentless proscriptions of an oath-bound order, allow themselves to be misled by this specious appeal. But when the citizens examine the case, with even ordinary care, they will find that the right of suffrage is controlled by the States in their sovereign capacity, independent of Congress; and that, in effect, the naturalization laws, of which so many have deemed it necessary to complain, secure to the adopted citizen certain civil advantages, but the States control the right of suffrage, and decide upon what terms and restrictions it shall be exercised. In the naturalization laws, passed by Congress in pursuance of the constitution, there is not a word that implies any control of the right to vote. The rights secured to the adopted citizens under these laws have never been and never can be complained of, because they are rights in which all are interested, native and foreign born. These rights are, among others, protection of persons and property against all foreign powers; the right to inheritance; the right to sue and be sued, &c. What native American or know-nothing can complain that these "immunities" are extended to an adopted citizen? It is true, there are certain disabilities enumerated; and the fact that these are enumerated and defined in the constitution and the laws of Congress, and that the more important right of suffrage is not defined in either, shows that the latter was intended to be left to the States; and that the important right of suffrage is not defined in either, shows that the latter was intended to be left to the States, and that the term of five years before a foreigner could become "a citizen" was intended to be a condition to certain *civil* and not *political* immunities. These disabilities are, that no one but "a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President."

And also:

"No person shall be a representative (in Congress) who shall not have attained the age of twenty-five years, and been *seven* years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

And again:

"No person shall be a senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years, and been *nine* years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

It will be seen how carefully the subject of suffrage is avoided in the constitution as a matter for congressional action. To make this clearer, we ask

attention to the second section of the first article of the constitution, in which the subject is directly and in terms referred to the States:

"The House of Representatives (of the United States) shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, *and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.*"

In other words, the citizen who can vote for members of the popular branch of the State legislature, can also vote for members of Congress. Need we ask the question, can the citizen who votes for a member of Congress be restricted from voting for President of the United States?

Stress has been laid upon the second section of the fourth article of the constitution as implying a general rule for voting, or a denial of the State control over suffrages:

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

But this alludes undoubtedly to the civil rights set forth in the naturalization and other laws. This is proved by the uniform action of the States in yielding to the laws of Congress on the subject of these civil rights, and in taking the control of the rights of suffrage into their own hands. It is true, that in some of the States the naturalization term of five years' residence is established as necessary to secure a vote to an "adopted citizen;" and in so far, the act of Congress may have suggested the action of the States; but in other States no difference is made between the native-born and the adopted citizen, whether in State or presidential elections. Mr. Jefferson, in the 7th volume of his writings, defines this principle clearly:

"Then comes the law of Congress declaring that what is the law in any State shall be the rule of decision in their courts, as to matters arising within that State, *except when controlled by their own statutes.* BUT THIS LAW OF CONGRESS HAS BEEN CONSIDERED AS EXTENDING TO CIVIL CASES ONLY."

This letter was written as late as June 12, 1847.

When Mr. Jefferson came into the presidential chair, he found the celebrated fourteen-years naturalization law of John Adams upon the statute-book; and in his first message he took bold and characteristic ground against it. We copy as follows from the message, and commend the language of the immortal sage to those new lights who seem so desirous of reviving the whole brood of antiquated and obsolete federalisms:

"I cannot omit recommending a revisal of the laws on the subject of naturalization. Considering the ordinary chances of human life, a denial of citizenship under a residence of fourteen years, is a denial to a great proportion who ask it, and controls a policy pursued from their first settlement by many of these States, and still believed of consequence to their prosperity. And shall we refuse to the unhappy fugitive from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? *The constitution, indeed, has wisely provided* THAT FOR ADMISSION TO CERTAIN OFFICES OF IMPORTANT TRUST *a residence shall be required sufficient to develope character and design. But might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to every one manifesting a bona fide purpose of embarking his life and fortunes permanently among us?* With restrictions, perhaps, to guard against fraudulent usurpation of our flag—an abuse which brings so much embezzlement and loss on the genuine citizen, and so much danger to the nation of being involved in war, that no endeavor should be spared to detect and suppress it."

We have not presented these facts and authorities for the purpose of suggesting any radical alteration of the naturalization laws, or for the purpose of commending any change in the system by which the States respectively regulate the rights of suffrage. Our object is simply to show that, according to unbroken and invariable usage, the States have taken into their own hands—where, indeed, Congress and the constitution have placed it—the settlement of the qualifications of voters.

The know-nothings are on the wrong scent, therefore, when they hope to reduce or abolish the right of adopted citizens to vote by appealing to congressional action, or by erecting a national organization for the purpose of controlling Congress to this end. The only effect that their movement would have, should they have the strength to carry a majority of the new Congress, would be to impair certain civil immunities to adopted citizens, in the preservation of which the native-born and the adopted citizens are almost equally interested, and in regard to which no one has ever been known to indulge complaints and animosities. We have already enumerated these immunities. The know-nothings must appeal to the States, which are sovereign in their control over the right of suffrage. They must change their crusade from the national government, and adapt their machinery to the State elections. Whether they will hold together long enough to change front before the batteries of the democratic party, time will show.

EXTRACT FROM THE POWERFUL SPEECH OF HON. SAMUEL A. SMITH, OF TENNESSEE.

Its mode of action.

This, Mr. President, presents one of the most serious objections to this novel organization, and must ultimately lead to the most serious consequences and flagrant abuses. In this model republic, where public sentiment controls not only the destiny of *men*, but the destiny of the nation, there is something revolting in the idea of *secrecy* in the action, conduct, or principles of any political organization.

The only means by which the people can arrive at a correct knowledge of the principles, policy, and merits of him who seeks public favor and a position in the councils of State, is by public discussion. And he who dares withhold from the electors his opinions on the political topics of the day is apt to be signally rebuked by the sovereign people when they come to exercise the high privilege of choosing their public servants. This new order, however, attempts to establish a new precedent in political conduct. Instead of seeking to win the people by an appeal to the correctness and justness of its creed, it reduces them into a midnight council, and, ere the astonished initiant has time to recover from his amazement at what he sees and hears around him, is induced to take a most horrid oath, which binds him *to support any candidate for political office who shall be nominated by the order to which he belongs*. This, sir, is no exaggeration of the oath taken by the members of this new party; and, although we have it not in any authentic shape from the order itself, yet it comes to us in such reliable form that I apprehend it will not be denied. I have before me the "True American" of the 23d December last, whose editor was one of the first to advocate the new organization, and who attached himself to THE ORDER at an early day. In combatting the tyranny of the Grand Council of the State of New York, he used the following language:

"Now, mark, we are not bound to vote for *a* candidate of the grand council's nomination, but for *any* member of THE ORDER, come from any source his nomination may."

This, sir, is equivalent to abolishing all the high privileges of the elective franchise, which has been properly denominated the "bulwark of American liberty." It takes from the elector the privilege of choosing for whom he shall vote. It ties his hands, and his conscience must submit. His vote is the commodity of a secret council or the edict of a secret society, and he dare not question the propriety of its dispensation. As immaculate as this new party claims to be, it is not without its difficulties and dissensions; and these have led to disclosures which exhibit its tyranny and unfold its dark designs, to the annoyance of its votaries and the astonishment of a curious world. The astonishing developments made in this new

order, after the election in the great State of New York—that seat of political wonders, which is said to have given birth to the new party—shows that it exercises a censorship which would have damned the secret council of Venice, and practices a despotism worthy only of a secret police of Austrian spies. In that election the "Know-nothing" candidate was unsuccessful; and as soon as it was ascertained that some of the *order* had voted contrary to the directions of their masters, the grand council immediately assembled, and passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the respective councils under the jurisdiction of this grand council, by their proper officers, are hereby instructed and required to withold the term-pass from, and forthwith expel from the council, all brothers who did not, as aforesaid, fully support the nominations in the last preceding resolution referred to, and who refused to answer as hereafter required, or who shall not offer an excuse satisfactory to the council for such non-support, and, for that purpose, said officers are fully empowered to demand and require of each member of his or their council that he or they do declare with uplifted hand, in open council, for whom he or they voted at the great November election, and excuse, if any they have to offer, for such non-support as aforesaid."

This decree of the grand council met the determined opposition of some of the subordinate councils and independent members of the order, and caused the editor of the "True American," a member of the new party, to exclaim as follows:

"Are Americans, sons of freemen, to be driven to the polls like a herd of cattle, there to deposite ballots for hypocrites, knaves, or scoundrels, to them known to be such—men they individually deride and despise—under the pain of imperial displeasure?

"We, who oppose Romanism upon the ground of absolutism in political matters, and contemn foreignism for its sectional intolerance, are probably among the last to succumb to an imperialism which exceeds the broadest despotism of Russia or Austria. And still, in the name of liberty, of Christian freedom, of regeneration from slavery, we are commanded to lick the feet of our would-be masters, or to withdraw from companionship with our brethren. 'Oh, liberty! what crimes are committed in thy name!'"

The dissatisfaction did not stop here, but, as before remarked, entered the subordinate councils. And at a meeting of the order in Brooklyn, the following preamble and resolution were unanimously adopted:

"And whereas the said grand council, at their recent session, adopted a resolution originally suggested by H. A. T. Granbury, requiring the members of this order, under certain pains and penalties, to *confess*, under oath, how they voted at the recent election, in palpable violation of the rights and privileges secured to, and so highly prized by, every true American: therefore,

"*Resolved*, That we repudiate and condemn the aforementioned action of the grand council as *anti-American*, *anti-republican*, and the most *unwarrantable*, *abominable*, and *dangerous assumption* of *despotic power* ever attempted in this republic; in its *confessional*, *pennance*, and threats of *excommunication*, only equalled by the holy *inquisition* of *Spain*, and only worthy of imitation by the *grand council* of *cardinals* at *Rome*."

These proceedings, Mr. Chairman, are a key to unlock the motives and designs of this new party, and to disclose the reason for the necessity of secrecy in its operations. *It distrusts the people*, and has no confidence in their capacity for self-government. It is conscious of the fallacy of its own political creed, and hence requires an *oath* to support it. If they have confidence in the patriotism of the people, and their capacity for self-government, why not go before them, in open day, and unfurl their banner, with their principles inscribed upon it, and rely upon the justness of their cause for their triumphant success? This want of confidence in the people has existed in the minds of those in favor of strong, consolidated governments since the foundation of the world; and oaths have been resorted to to

bind men to constancy in that which, upon reflection, they know to be wrong. Such was the case in ancient Athens, when thirty of its most virtuous citizens were banished the city. The authorities, conscious of the infamy of their conduct, and satisfied that, upon sober reflection, the people would repent, and reverse the decree, required them to take an oath never to mention even the return of the banished patriots. This is the only precedent I am aware of for know-nothingism in the United States. This new party, it is true, has not the power of corporal punishment, as had the suffetes of the city of Athens. But it is equally inexorable in its decrees, and commands absolute subserviency in all its subjects, at the peril of excommunication. Such principles, such conduct, may have been excusable in the days of Paganism, but is unbecoming the freest people on earth, in this age of progress, where the public will is the public law of the land.

THE FRUITS OF THE SECRET ORDER.

From the same speech.

We are told by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SOLLERS) that this party "knows no North, no South, no East, no West," and that it is national enough to cover all parts of this wide-spread confederacy." What evidence has it given of such exalted and extended patriotism? Judged by the fruits it has produced, there is nothing in it to commend it to the American people, and more *especially* the people of the South. But, on the contrary, the results of the late elections in the northern States are well calculated to cause the people of the South to pause and reflect before entering into bonds with this new sect. Look to the record. They have revolutionized Maine, and sent to the Senate of the United States an open, avowed, uncompromising abolitionist in the place of BRADBURY, a *national democrat;* and to this House (with but one exception) they have returned abolitionists, or—what amounts to about the same in the North—*whigs*. And the old Bay State—which stood shoulder to shoulder with the foremost in the day that tried men's souls; whose sons gave their time, means, and talents to the good work; and who, notwithstanding her modern heresies, has ever had men in the Congress of the United States who have commanded the respect and admiration of the whole country—how fares it with her? In her recent election all men of enlarged and statesmanlike views were displaced to make room for Burlingame, Comins, Davis, and Knapp, abolitionists of the darkest hue. And in the other branch of Congress, the seat once filled and adorned by Webster, Choate, and Everett, is now disgraced by HENRY WILSON! who, it is said, was a supporter of Henry Clay in 1844—a supporter of Van Buren and Adams in 1848—a coalitionist in 1850—a republican till 1854, and afterwards a know-nothing. His only inquiry has been for the shortest cut to office. A graphic picture, Mr. Chairman, but a true one, and a faithful likeness of more than *one prominent member* of this new parasaical sect. I do not wish to do injustice to Mr. Wilson; and as his election is one of the most important political acts of this new party, I beg leave to read a short speech of his, made in Boston on Thursday last, at an anti-slavery meeting, and also an extract from the speech of Mr. Burlingame, a know-nothing member to the next Congress, which it will be seen is fully endorsed by the Massachusetts senator. Mr. Burlingame said:

"If asked to state specifically what he would do, he would answer: 1st, repeal the Nebraska bill; 2d, repeal the fugitive slave law; 3d, abolish slavery in the District of Columbia; 4th, abolish the inter-State slave trade; next he would declare that slavery should not spread to one inch of the territory of the Union; he would then put the government actually and perpetually on the side of freedom—by which he meant that a bright-eyed boy in Massachusetts should have as good a chance for promotion in the navy as a boy of one of the first families in Virginia. He would have our foreign consuls take side with the noble Kossuth, and against the papal butcher Bedini. He would have judges who believe in a higher law, and an anti slavery constitution, an anti-slavery Bible, and an anti-slavery God! Having thus denationalized slavery, he would not menace it in the States where it exists, but would say to the States, it is your local institution; hug it to your bosom until it destroys you. But he would say you must let our freedom alone. (Applause.) If you but touch the hem of the garment of freedom we will trample you to the earth. (Loud applause.) This is the only condition of repose, and it must come to this. He was encouraged by the recent election in the North, and he defended the 'new movement,' which he said was born of Puritan blood, and was against despotism of all kinds. This new party should be judged, like others, by its fruits. It had elected a champion of freedom to the United States Senate for four years, to fill the place of a man who was false to freedom and not true to slavery. For himself he could say that so long as life dwelt in his bosom, so long would he fight for liberty and against slavery. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that soon the time might come when the sun should not rise on a master nor set on a slave."

After Mr. Burlingame had taken his seat there were loud and continued calls for "Wilson," in answer to which Hon. Henry Wilson spoke as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen: This is not the time nor the place for me to utter a word. You have listened to the eloquence of my young friend, and here to-night I endorse every sentiment he has uttered. In public or in private life, in majorities or minorities, at home or abroad, I intend to live and to die with unrelenting hostility to slavery on my lips. I make no compromises anywhere, at home or abroad; I shall yield nothing of my anti-slavery sentiments to advance my own personal interests, to advance party interest, or to meet the demands of any State or section of our country. I hope to be able to maintain on all occasions these principles, to comprehend in my affections the whole country and the people of the whole country—and when I say the whole country, I want everybody to understand that I include in that term Massachusetts and the North. This is not the time for me to detain you. You have called on me, most unexpectedly, to say a word, and, having done so, I will retire, thanking you for the honor of this occasion."

I have read these speeches, that the country may see the character of this new party in the northern States. I would like time to comment on the treasonable doctrines here asserted, but time will not permit.

I have still an abiding faith in the good old commonwealth. She cannot long resist the silent appeals of that towering monument which overlooks her chief city, erected to commemorate the first great battle of our revolutionary sires in favor of equal rights, equal laws, and the freedom of conscience.

From the great Empire State they have returned whigs or abolitionists, in the stead of Union-loving and constitution abiding democrats. From New Jersey, that gallant little State, within whose borders the most important battles of our revolution were fought, one *democrat* and four fusionists have been returned to the next Congress. And in Pennsylvania, whose democracy heretofore has known no North, no South, but has been true to the whole country, in peace and in war, this new order has not only stricken down democrats whose nationality was proverbial, but they have invaded the ranks of their allies, the *whigs*, and immolated upon the altar of intolerance all of that party who were known to entertain political views broad enough to extend south of Mason and Dixon's line, or who were supposed to entertain the religious dogmas which had been tabooed by this new order.

From Ohio, the national democracy have not elected a single member to the next Congress. There, abolitionism, freesoilism, whigism, or its other synonym, know-nothingism, reigns supreme!

From Michigan, the home of the great leader of the democratic party, and the able advocate of the doctrine of "non-intervention," the whigs, abolitionists, and know-nothings, have elected three out of the four members to the next Congress; and the present know-nothing legislature has passed the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That our senators in Congress be, and they are hereby, instructed, and our representatives requested to vote for, and use their best exertions to procure the passage of an act of Congress that shall prohibit the introduction or exercise of slavery in any of the Territories of the United States, and especially in Kansas and Nebraska, and to introduce, without delay, a bill for the latter purpose.

"*Resolved*, That our senators in Congress be, and they are hereby, instructed,

and our representatives requested, to use their best exertions to procure the immediate repeal of the act of 1850, known as the fugitive-slave law."

From these resolutions it appears that the know-nothings of Michigan are not only willing to make LEWIS CASS stultify himself, and end his long and useful public career by an act of folly and shame, but are willing to hazard the existence of the Union itself, by a fanatical crusade against the constitutional rights of the south.

From the State of Indiana, in the present Congress, we have seven democrats whose course upon great exciting questions has given assurances that their principles and patriotism are coextensive with the whole country. Five of these seven have been defeated for re-election, and fusionists, the modern name for abolitionists, have been, by the aid of the *know-nothings*, returned in their stead. The gallant young senator from Iowa has been superseded by an abolitionist, (Harlan,) who was supported, if not brought forward, by this new party. In Illinois every *national democrat* who was a candidate for office had to encounter the ceaseless, unsleeping opposition of the know-nothings.

HSH 22246

END OF
TITLE